DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 048 738 EM 008 779

AUTHOR	Weber, David O., Ed.
TITLE	99 Films on Drugs.
INSTITUTION	California Univ., Berkeley. Media Extension Center.; Educational Film Library Association, Inc., New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY	Maurice Falk Medical Fund, Pittsburgh, Pa.
PUB DATE	70
NOTE	72p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Drug Abuse, Drug Addiction, Films, Health Education, Law Enforcement, *Narcotics, Stimulants, Youth Problems

ABSTRACT

This catalog describes and evaluates 16-millimeter films about various aspects of drug use. Among the subjects covered by the 99 films are the composition and effects of different drugs, reasons why people use drugs, life in the drug culture, the problem of law enforcement, and various means of dealing with drug users. Each film is synopsized. Two panels, one of adult experts (including educators, physicians, media specialists, and law enforcement officers) and one of teenagers (the most frequent target audience of drug education), evaluated the films, and their frank conclusions accompany each description. Each film is rated on a six-point scale from poor to excellent, and the recommended viewing audience, from the primary to professional level, is indicated. The films are indexed by topic and rating. A list of additional unreviewed films and a directory of distributors are also included. (JY)

ED048738

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Basic Facts on Cities

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED
BY C. Cameron Macauley
Univ. of Calif. Extension Media Center
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING
UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF
EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE
THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF
THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Published by the Educational Film Library Association.
This book was originally published by the University of California,
with a grant from the Maurice Falk Medical Fund, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
Permission to re-publish these reviews—in their entirety—is encouraged.
For reprint permission apply to EFLA.
Editorial Consultant: David O. Weber
Copyright of this edition 1970 by EFLA.
$3.00 per copy.

ED048738

99 films on drugs

Table of Contents

Introduction 1
Method and Rating System 2
Substance Abuse in Perspective 4
From 99 Reviews — New Perspectives 5
Statement from the Chairman
of the Teenage Committee 7
Film Descriptions, Evaluations, Ratings, Levels 8
Ratings Index 58
Index
Categories 60
Classified Index 60
Series Listing 65
Drug Films Not Viewed by the Committee 65
Drug Films Not Available From Original Distributor 66
Distributor Directory 67

Em 008 796

Introduction

The upsurge in use of mind-affecting drugs in the United States during the 1960s – and the consequent demand for informational materials to explain this phenomenon in all its aspects – has generated particular interest in the medium of 16-millimeter educational films.

A great many titles are available on the subject of drug abuse, and requests for advice on recommended films for showing to various groups are received by the University almost daily. Unfortunately, even a cursory screening of the vast array of drug films in circulation reveals that their quality varies widely. Until quite recently, however, no compilation of critical evaluations of such films has been available. Even those few lists which have been published are limited in scope or circulated among specialized audiences.

Recognizing the need for a comprehensive listing of drug film titles, including a clear description of the contents of each film and – most important – some specific guidelines for assessing their accuracy, value and impact, the Extension Media Center of the University of California at Berkeley, in cooperation with the Student Health Service, the Ernest V. Cowell Memorial Hospital, established a drug film review committee in September, 1968.

Members of the Committee were selected from a broad cross section of the community. Among those who participated were University of California deans, administrators, professors, graduate students and staff members of the schools of Social Welfare, Public Health and Law, the Department of Criminology and the University Statewide Extension; a hospital director, a superintendent of nurses, a senior pharmacist, physicians, psychiatrists, health educators and media specialists; staff professionals from the California State Department of Public Health; Catholic priests and Protestant ministers; a police narcotics bureau lieutenant; and a supervising parole agent from the California Youth Authority. Several of these committee members are distinguished authorities in the special field of drug use and abuse, or experts in the production and utilization of communication media. Nearly all have some particular expertise or interest in the subject. But perhaps a facet of the review process which was most unusual was the inclusion of young people ranging in age from 14 to 20 on a separate committee which screened and evaluated a majority of the same films. These young people represent the age-group which is most often selected as the target audience for drug education. Their viewpoints and reactions were penetrating, enlightening and, occasionally, surprising.

The Method

During the 21 months of the evaluation effort, invitations were mailed weekly to all adult committee members to attend a Tuesday screening of two or more films at a designated location on the University's Berkeley campus. Although not all films were reviewed by each committee member, screenings attracted a substantial attendance. Meanwhile, the staff of the Extension Media Center were engaged in what may be the most thorough research effort yet undertaken to locate names, descriptions, producers and distributors of existing films on drugs and narcotics.

The 99 films evaluated in this handbook – a startlingly large collection of titles for a single subject category, according to media experts – represent the best available information as to 16-mm. drug education films currently in circulation. In addition, films which for various reasons could not be screened by the committee, have been withdrawn from circulation or are not presently obtainable in 16-mm. are listed in a supplementary index. This brings the total number of films listed in this handbook, in fact, to 156.

Immediately following the critical evaluation of each film is an overall *Rating* and a guide to the suitable audience *Level* or suggested maturity range.

Rating has been determined by an averaging of the EMC evaluation sheets completed by each committee member. The *Rating* system for each film offered the following possible classifications:

excellent
very good
good
average
fair
poor

Level has been determined from the recommendations noted on each evaluation sheet. Underlining indicates the level or levels considered most appropriate by the majority of the committee, where such distinctions were suitable. (In general, they were not considered suitable for films rated below average.)

The key to abbreviations for *Level* is as follows:

P – Primary grades (1–3)
I – Intermediate grades (4–6)
J – Junior High School grades (7–9)
H – High School grades (10–12)
C – Junior College, College, University
A – Adult Education and General Use
PRO – Professional Use (profession usually listed in parentheses)

Some Conclusions

As is evident from a reading of this handbook, only a small proportion of the films available on the subject of drugs were considered by the committee to have independent merit. The vast majority – particularly those produced before 1968 – contain pharmacological inaccuracies, scientifically unsupported theses, misleading statements, exaggerations, crucial omissions, blatant biases and significant dramatic or filmic weaknesses. Many experts blame the sudden explosion in youthful drug use in part to the loss of credibility such wrong-headed attempts at drug education have inflicted on school, health and legal authorities.

With the past as guide, then, it follows that users of drug education films must handle their materials as circumspectly as they would have young people handle drugs. This means, at the most obvious level, previewing EVERY film before showing it to an audience. A careful reading of the descriptions and evaluations in this handbook should provide a general basis on which to select the appropriate film for a particular audience or use. It should also suggest some possible reactions – reactions with which the user may then be prepared to cope. The production data listed below the film title can, similarly, offer important clues to the quality of a film and the approach it will take. Producers, directors and consultants often have a style or an attitude that is reflected in every material with which they are associated (though even this – at times – may be inconsistent). So, the warning still holds: NEVER show a film to an audience without screening it thoughtfully first to become prepared about its merits and weaknesses.

Committee experts on the use of media have suggested these additional tips:

- Even poor films may include excellent sequences. Portions of films, particularly of long films, may often be employed to greater effect than the entire film.
- It is best to provide some introductory explanation of what a film is going to discuss, what the audience is going to see and why it is being shown.
- Opportunity for discussion and comments from the audience should always be provided after a film showing. This will almost certainly have more solid educational value than the film itself.
- Keep film audiences small enough so that everyone has a chance to respond in the discussion.
- Don't show a film if you are not prepared to handle the reactions and comments it may generate, either through consultation with reference books or a guest expert.
- On the other hand, don't despair if all questions can't be answered conclusively. In the field of drugs, many very basic concerns are still subject to wide differences in even the most informed opinion. The 99 films here reviewed offer clear testimony to that fact.

Substance Abuse in Perspective

by
Henry B. Bruyn, M.D.

Director of Student Health Services
University of California, Berkeley
Co-Chairman of the Adult Film Review Committee

I would like to recommend some basic changes in the terminology and definitions surrounding *drugs*.* First there is the misappropriation of the word *drug* itself, since the *drugs* referred to in the lay press, educational films and in public discussion of the problems of abuse are often not of therapeutic or prophylactic value in the practice of medicine. We should, I think, substitute the word *substance*. The substances which throughout history have produced problems of abuse and concern for civilized man have been those substances which can be described as mind-altering – substances which have the facility of producing changes in the functions, feelings and emotions of the human mind. Mind-altering substances of a wide variety have produced serious social and individual problems for man. In general, they may be divided into four groups: alcohol**, narcotics, dangerous drugs and hallucinogens.

The other terms merit special consideration. The first, *dependence*, is a successful substitute for the confused, blurred and biased terms *addiction* and *habituation*. These latter words have been so widely used and misused as to become almost meaningless at the present time in discussing the problems of abuse. *Dependence* is physical reliance on a substance; the individual is not healthy or well if the specific substance is kept from him. Physical dependence is an adaptive state that manifests itself by intense physical disturbances – usually referred to as withdrawal or abstinence syndromes – when administration of the substance is discontinued. These physical disturbances are relieved by readministration of the substance, and the relief experienced by the individual reinforces a form of emotional dependence.

The second term necessary to enlightened consideration of substance abuse is *tolerance* (several of the films touch upon or attempt to define this term). *Tolerance* means that increasingly large doses of a specific substance may be required to produce the same degree of relief and to prevent the withdrawal of abstinence syndrome.

These basic terms, clearly understood and appropriately used, may contribute to more effective drug education and help improve future films dedicated to this subject of great national importance.

In learning to face up to and deal with drug abuse more completely, more profoundly, it will be necessary for films to reveal motivation more clearly. Acknowledging the drug ambience syndrome is not enough. There are the substances themselves; what about their attraction? What really leads an individual to first try? What pleasures lead him to repeat? Despite the fears that facing this heart-of-the-matter may *encourage* drug abuse, somehow it must be dealt with. The poets and writers have; film-makers must find ways, too.

*DRUG ABUSE IN PERSPECTIVE by Henry B. Bruyn, M.D. *Occupational Health Nursing,* April 1969.

**Some films on alcohol were reviewed by the Committee but since nowhere near a comprehensive effort was made in this area, these are not included in this handbook.

From 99 Reviews — New Perspectives

by
C. Cameron Macauley

Head of the Extension Media Center
University of California (universitywide)
Co-Chairman of the Adult Film Review Committee

This publication represents a balanced research and review effort spanning nearly three years from initial planning. The evaluations are based on more than 50 hours of copious note-taking in darkened screening rooms — far greater effort, it would appear, than usually goes into pre-production research for the average film on drugs. It is hoped that this comprehensive assessment will prove of value to the producers of future drug films, as well as educators seeking the best available films.

Film producers have been drawn to the subject of soft and hard "glamour" drugs not only because of its sensational nature, but also out of sheer profit motive. (These 99 films represent estimated minimum production costs of between $4 million and $7 million!) Producers have not found the less glamorous drugs — alcohol, tobacco, etc. — nearly as attractive, even though there is a profitable market for films on these subjects, as well.

Drug abuse is an ancient, baffling problem. The proliferation of new chemical substances together with greatly increased distribution (legal and illegal) within our widespread drug culture makes it ever more baffling. But these reviews indicate that many producers of drug films are merely pushers of their own brands of bad dope. They often sensationalize their somber subject, propagate popular mythology and more often than not discredit their own credibility. To realize that some are uninformed – or worse, misinformed – makes it all the more shameful.

But there may be new hope. The films of the past few years show gradual improvement. THE DISTANT DRUMMER series begins to consider seriously the history of drugs and just where we stand in it, as well as the world – not simply local – implications of drug use (though at times these films go about their business diffusely). Note, too, that these are government-financed films!

The number of producers who have begun to consult with us in an effort to learn from the committee's findings is increasing. They offer indications for hope; they – at least the really hip young producers – are willing to leave behind the embarrassingly obvious, the warning threats, the self-righteous cries of "shame!" Instead, on their storyboards are appearing plans for films which will meet real, crucial needs for such material: films addressed directly to the young drug users (rather than to those who have just not quite started yet); films for the confused, distraught parents of users; and, like the remarkable, astonishingly genuine YOUNG FILM-MAKERS TALK ABOUT DRUGS series, films addressed to ghetto youth in their own languages. [Recently a former heroin dependent asked my encouragement for a film which will interview individuals currently dependent on the drug – *not* "ex-addicts," but those who know painfully where the truth lies.]

The users of drug films are learning, too. We now know (as DRUGS THE CHILDREN ARE CHOOSING so clearly demonstrates) that we are living in a drug-steeped culture, and that we have easy access to legal drugs which are or can be dangerous – including alcohol and tobacco as well as prescription and illegal drugs. So now, as we mature as educators, we are beginning to seek out better, more credible information and films of reasoned persuasion.

Widespread government interest – national as well as local – in the Committees' findings is gratifying, as are their indications of greater support for the production of new and more enlightened drug films. The old image of the official government attitude – threatening, spying, punitive, biased and at the same time hypocritical – may just change if our governments really do face the realities and reason.

Intelligent, creative and much more knowledgeable film-makers are now on the scene. They want to take up the subject in a new and truthful way (we acknowledge that a few already have: A NICE KID LIKE YOU, GROOVING, DAVID, WORLD OF THE WEED, among them). After a long and often tedious search through these 99-plus films, it is our profound hope they will be greatly encouraged. Shouldn't the second hundred be the best?

9 01

A Statement by the Chairman of the Teenage Drug Film Review Committee, Age 17

The idea of drug education through the medium of film-making and showing is both right and wrong. Drug films can have opposite effects on different people, just like drugs do themselves. How effective they are – and whether effective in the way their makers intended – depends on the pupils who see them. For instance, if a child from age six to sixteen doesn't have a great social standing (or many friends) and wants to "be in" and he sees a drug film scene showing a group of people getting high, he may immediately think that if he joins the drug craze he'll then be known, recognized and happier.

Never is it right in films to try to scare, or say that drugs lead to instant death, disorder, social problems and police trouble. Even though these things can happen, too many people are using unnatural chemicals – indicating there must be something beneficial in them – a thing films almost always try to ignore or put down.

Drugs can lead to greater insights in living such as new occupations, new relationships between people and awaken individual thought. A drug is good if it is used right and you want to experience and learn; a drug is bad if it is abused and not treated with care. Films, though, can point the way and suggest.

The Addicted (1958)

52 min., b/w. *Distributor:* Association Instructional Materials. *Producer:* CBS and Prudential Insurance Company.

The first segment of this two-part film – originally produced for the CBS Television series *The Twentieth Century* – examines the actual case history of a young New York heroin addict named Freddie. Freddie's story – arrest at an early age, escape from the island school to which he had been committed, a return to drugs, a life of insecurity, despondency, compulsive drug abuse – is told by his mother, by the head of a self-help organization called Narcotics Anonymous, and by Freddie himself during a jail interview. Part II of the film examines the nature of drug addiction, its relationship to crime, and the attitude of public officials and agencies to the treatment of addicts. Interviews with former narcotics users and New York City authorities establish the conclusions: addiction is a sickness, users are passive when under the influence, they commit crimes only because the illegality of their habit makes it tremendously expensive, resources for effective treatment of addicts are almost totally lacking, and a change in public thinking is necessary if narcotics addiction is to be dealt with as a health problem and not as a crime problem.

Evaluation: *A very good treatment of the subject for its time, but a film which is now seriously dated – even if its message is not. The film is well produced, there are several memorable scenes (one in particular, of men writhing through heroin withdrawal in a jail ward) and the reportage is interesting. Narrator Walter Cronkite, however, looks disturbingly young, and the documentary scenes were obviously not shot in 1970.*
Rated: *Very good – on basis of content.* **Level:** *H, C, A.*

The Allure of Drugs

See **Drugs the Children Are Choosing.**

Beyond LSD: A Film for Concerned Adults and Teenagers (1968)

25 min., color. *Distributor:* Bailey/Film Associates. *Producer/Director:* Paul Burnford. *Screenplay:* Hilda Bohem. *Medical Consultant:* J. Thomas Ungerleider, UCLA.

A group of anxious middle-class parents express their fears that long hair, strange clothing styles, and raucous music are signs that their children are plunging irreversibly into a shadow life of LSD abuse, degradation, and crime. They are told by a neighborhood counselor, Dr. Wright, that this is not necessarily so – not if the parents substitute reason, patience, and understanding for hysteria, lies, petty niggling, and rule by fiat. The doctor shows a filmed talk in which UCLA psychiatry professor J. Thomas Ungerleider urges parents to try to understand a teenager's struggle with his anger, his sexuality, and his emerging identity. Drugs let him hide this struggle from himself, but adult sympathy can forestall his turning to such a refuge. He advises that if drugs are discussed openly they lose their appeal as forbidden fruit.

Evaluation: *Although the acting in the film is often strained and unnatural, the film is mature in concept. It is directed primarily toward an adult audi-*

ence, but has something to say to both generations. Some adults seem to resent it: "A set of parents are displayed behaving like fools in one context and sitting around being hypnotized by a very wise man in the other," wrote one committee member. But teenage viewers invariably praised the film: "Every parent should see it," commented several. That seems to be the acid test.

Rated: *Very good to excellent by both committees.* **Level:** *J, H, C, A.*

Bridge from Noplace (1968)

22 min., color. *Distributor:* National AV Center. An Airlie Production. *Executive Producer:* Murdock Head, M.D. *Producer:* Frank Cavanaugh. *Sponsors:* National Institute of Mental Health, George Washington University School of Medicine and Public Affairs, the District of Columbia Medical Society and the American Academy of General Practice. *Consultant:* Alfred M. Freedman, M.D.

A review of the national drug problem, with emphasis on new approaches to therapy for heroin addicts. The film documents the widespread use of marijuana, LSD and heroin in America today through interviews with young users. "The problem," declares one, "is that I'm living in a drug culture." Dr. Stanley M. Yolles, former director of the National Institute of Mental Health, describes the rehabilitation programs and research underway at federal hospitals in Lexington, Ky., and Fort Worth, Texas. The goal is treatment rather than detention. The film looks at other addict rehabilitation methods: Synanon, Daytop Village, methadone and cyclazocine therapy. Young people are rejecting accepted values, the film admits, and some of those values are, indeed, hypocritical. For example, a lawyer points out that only when the middle class young began to be arrested did society become concerned about drug abuse. "After 60 centuries of familiarity with drugs," the film concludes, "society is only now beginning to be enlightened." For drug addicts and for the alienated young, we must build bridges back into society. Narrated by Rod Steiger.

Evaluation: *A factual, temperate – if slightly hasty and inconclusive – summation of current federal government attitudes toward drug use and drug addiction treatment in the United States. The film is well produced, both in conception and execution, although several reviewers found fault with the overly theatrical diction of narrator Steiger. The film attempts to be unbiased, comprehensive and progressive – and generally succeeds.*

Rated: *Good to very good.* **Level:** *H, C, A.*

The Chemistry of Behavior (1963)

29 min., b/w. *Distributor:* NET Film Service. *Producer:* Maver-Sklar, Inc.

A National Educational Television report from the series *Focus on Behavior,* this film examines current scientific inquiry into the biochemical mechanisms by which drugs affect the brain – and hence behavior. Animal experiments, use of psychoactive drugs to treat the mentally ill, and graphic representations of the differential effects of various drugs on various brain centers are among topics featured.

Evaluation: *An informative, popularized film of some general interest, but of limited usefulness. Drug abuse is considered only by implication. The treat-*

ment is non-technical, journalistic and, overall, rather dull. The committee was divided as to audience for the film, some judging it suitable only for college students of experimental psychology, others suggesting a place in junior and senior high school science classrooms.
Rated: *Average.* **Level:** *J, H, C. A.*

The Circle: An Approach to Drug Addiction (1967)

57 min., b/w. *Distributor:* McGraw-Hill. A National Film Board of Canada Production. *Producer:* John Kemeny. *Director/Writer:* Mort Ransen.

The documentary-drama of one man's encounter with the uncompromising, self-imposed disciplines of Daytop Village on Staten Island, a rehabilitation center where addicts come to learn to live without narcotics. The film was shot in the cinema-verite manner, with the real dialogue of the "junkies," and with only one actor, the central character, to give continuity. The treatment at Daytop is designed to strip the addict of his evasions, his self-deceptions, his protective barriers – leaving him only with his fears. Surrounded by people who have themselves faced many of these same fears and survived, the addict finds himself in a supportive environment. His associates understand and care about him, but will not extend undue sympathy. Daytop uses an "encounter" form of group therapy in which the residents give their emphatic opinions of one another's behavior and attitudes. The exchanges often become heated, even brutal, but no one is permitted to leave his seat or strike another member. Out of it all comes a growing awareness of self, a strengthening of the person, and a gradual emergence from fear and withdrawal.

Evaluation: *A strong, emotional, dramatic – but authentic – film treatment. There are weaknesses in pace, the central character's motivation is cloudy, and several viewers objected to the distractive "beeping-out" of profanity. However, most viewers, both adults and teenagers, felt it was a good presentation of the methods of group therapy in action, although some believed it did not clearly indicate the ultimate long-term effectiveness of the method.*

Rated: *Good to very good.* **Level:** *H, C, A.*

The Current Scene (1968)

26 min., b/w. *Distributor:* NET Film Service. A KCET-TV Production. *Executive Producer:* Richard S. Scott, M.D. *Producer/Director:* Joel Standard and David Germer.

A report on the impact of marijuana on Southern California culture, contrasting the liberal views of the younger generation with the conservative stand of the "establishment." Scenes include a "pot party" where students express their scorn for the fables about marijuana and its so-called dangers; a pusher breaking up a "brick" of marijuana into "joints"; customs officials searching cars for marijuana at the Mexican border. Also includes a number of interviews with marijuana users and non-users, of all backgrounds and races, government spokesmen, and a worried mother. A psychologist insists marijuana inhibits aggression; however, he thinks more research has to be done in this area. All sides, those who praise, those who damn and those who merely report, are represented.

Evaluation: *Although the technical quality of this kinescope is very poor, the content was considered by all adults to be very good. They felt it presented the pros and cons of marijuana smoking without bias; one woman was impressed that it neither tried to scare nor to be graphic about drug-taking.*
Rated: *Very good.* **Level:** *J, H, C, A.*

Danger: LSD (1967)

25 min., color. *Distributor:* KRON-TV. *Producer:* KRON-TV.

A pastiche of viewpoints about LSD, its merits and dangers, efforts to control its use, and the implications of the "emerging" hippie subculture filmed as part of its award-winning *Assignment Four* series by San Francisco's KRON-TV. Against background scenes shot in the city's Haight-Ashbury district – considered by many to have been the epicenter of the national psychedelic explosion – the film juxtaposes interviews with experienced LSD users, prominent advocates of drug experimentation such as Timothy Leary, medical authorities, religious leaders, law enforcement officials and California Governor Ronald Reagan.

Evaluation: *Shallow, choppy, run-of-the-mill television journalism. An even-handed approach was attempted, but more viewers thought it biased – citing in particular the closing statement by the governor – than unbiased. The material is probably now of greater historical than medico-sociological interest.*
Rated: *Average.* **Level:** *H, C, A.*

Dangerous Drugs (1964)

30 min., b/w. *Distributor:* University of Southern California. *Producers:* USC/KNXT.

A kinescope lecture from a University of Southern California *Apothecary* course series for educational television. Lecturer Dr. Edward S. Brady defines and describes, primarily from a pharmacological point of view, why the "dangerous drugs" – defined as those which are unsafe for self use without prescription, including sulfa, penicillin, etc. – are harmful, emphasizing side effects and addictive potential. The law defines abuse, he notes, as: using drugs which have a direct effect on the central nervous system with the intent of becoming intoxicated, distorting the senses, etc. Alcohol is exempted from the "abuse" provision because it is "controlled" by federal and state laws. The distinction between "habit" and "addiction" – the latter characterized by increasing doses and development of tolerance – is also explained.

Evaluation: *This lecture-on-film was felt to be extremely boring by everyone who saw it. However, it was also felt to be valuable for its attempt to clearly define what drugs are, in both traditional and modern uses. Many of the teenagers thought the film did not adequately describe the effects of the drugs thus not clearly stating why they were called "dangerous".*
Rated: *Fair to average.* **Level:** *A.*

David (1967)

54 min., b/w. *Distributor:* Time-Life Films. A Time-Life and Drew Association Production. *Executive Producer:* Robert Drew. *Film-maker:* D. A. Pennebaker.

Documents life during "one week by the sea" at the original Synanon House

in Santa Monica, California, mainly by observing a member named David. Handsome, athletic, blond, David is a jazz musician who became a drug user in college. The film records this week of Synanon activity by showing simply what happened, without a plan, without rehearsal or acting. The film-maker is one of the masters of this cinema-verite style, Don Pennebaker. The drama hinges on a crisis in David's long struggle toward rehabilitation – a visit by his wife and infant son. Synanon founder-director Chuck Dederich and the House Leader fear that the lure of his family will cause David to leave prematurely – furnish an excuse to escape from Synanon's stressful, lonely road to self-reliance. Other small dramas unfold as the week passes, and as we observe the passionate exchanges which take place in the grueling Synanon encounter sessions. Some collapse under the pressure – flee the house to return to addiction and despair. But as the film closes and David wades into the buffeting surf at the beach, it appears that he somehow will endure.

Evaluation: *Technically, this film shows the rough edges of its blunt, uncompromising observational film technique. It reveals an important human endeavor and shows unfortunate individuals struggling to help themselves and others. It is not moralistic. These addicts take on the dimensions of whole persons, but not without their emotional problems to overcome – problems which may have led them to drugs. Intimately reveals through interlocking episodes how addicts face their difficulty with frightening uncertainty. The continuity is sometimes confusing, but the overall theme provides powerful insights. Of particular value to classes in criminology, sociology, social welfare, psychology and in a series of film presentations on drug education to show the desperate end results of drug addiction and the remarkable self-help program at Synanon.*

Rated: *Very good.* **Level:** *H, C, A. PRO.*

A Day in the Death of Donnie B. (1969)

14 min., b/w. *Distributor:* National AV Center. *Producer:* Audio Productions for the National Institute of Mental Health. *Writer:* Carl Fick.

Episodes filmed in cinema-verite style from a day in the life of a young poverty-stricken black heroin addict. Scenes of the slum in which he wanders are intercut with brief off- and on-camera comments by other ghetto dwellers, his mother, and the police who patrol this beat. All foretell Donnie's death. Meanwhile, Donnie lives for a "fix," and scrambles for the money to buy one. He panhandles without success, snatches a purse only to find it empty, attempts to burgle a car but has to settle for a wheel. Even then, his withdrawal symptoms prevent him from successfully removing it. Finally he wins a dice game in a vacant lot and makes his "buy" from a pusher in a cellar hallway. The lyrics of a folksong on the soundtrack comment on this dreary day in his half-life of addiction and despair.

Evaluation: *"A good 'scare' film," one viewer summarized for the committee. "An excellent film on heroin addiction and the problems related to it. Not many of this category I would use. This one I would." Technical quality is excellent, and the musical background was considered especially effective. The film was awarded the Red Ribbon Award, American Film Festival, 1970.*

Rated: *Very good.* **Level:** *H, C, A.*

Distant Drummer Series

See individual titles:

Movable Scene
Flowers of Darkness
Bridge from Noplace

See also series listing, page 65.

Dr. Gardner Murphy, Part II (1964)

50 min., b/w. *Distributor:* Association Instructional Materials and Psychological Cinema Register, Pennsylvania State University.

Informal discussion-interview together with Dr. R. I. Evans. Dr. Murphy comments on modern and recent psychology, relating to his own experience. Through his interdisciplinary considerations he explores the uniqueness of personality, subliminal and transensory perception, sensory deprivation, etc. He arrives at basic theoretical observations that ultimately bear upon the drug problem, but does not link them directly to it.

Evaluation: *A higher education film requiring a basic knowledge of psychology. Murphy provides precise, concise answers to Evans pertinent questions. Since it is not directly a drug film, it could be used with college students, professionals and intellectuals to approach the drug problem obliquely. Fails to use the film medium to advantage, since it is merely a straight talk-recording.*

Rated: *Good to very good on basis of content.* **Level:** *C, A.*

Drug Abuse: Bennies and Goofballs (1967)

20 min., b/w. *Distributor:* Public Health Service, National Medical AV Center.

A Food and Drug Administration *Special Report* on misuse of readily available amphetamines and barbituates. Scenes graphically illustrate abuse of these drugs and dangerous results with a variety of drug users: a truck driver, a motor cyclist, an 18-year-old murderer. Describes physical, mental deterioration of addicts and shows withdrawal convulsions. Warns against unwitting overdosage of sleeping pills leading to death and danger in mixing both stimulants and depressants. Underworld traffic in drugs is described by then F.D.A. Commissioner Dr. James L. Goddard. Scenes of law enforcement. Describes President Johnson's 1965 drug control law which requires more accurate records of legal sales, gives agents powers of summary arrest and seizure. Paul Newman is on-camera commentator.

Evaluation: *Still essentially valid, though not very recent, this "official" government film makes an effort to be honest, factual and objective. Its straight documentary sequences help it to succeed in this, and Dr. Goddard and actor Newman speak with authority, conviction and concern. Though it contains some of the usual elements of fear tactics, its presentation is generally acceptable and effective. The southern defense counsel who interviews his convicted client-murderer about his history of drug use is himself a shocking example of blind insensitivity.*

Rated: *Good.* **Level:** *J, H, C, A.*

Drug Abuse: A Call to Action (1969)

27 min., color. *Distributor:* Association Instruction Materials. A Portside Production, Inc. *Producer/Writer/Director:* John G. Fuller.

A report on a coordinated community-wide program to deal with the drug abuse problem in Greenwich, Connecticut. Instituted by the Greenwich Health Association with the help of the American Social Health Association, the voluntary program involves parents, teachers, young people, doctors, hospitals, churches, the police department and other interested organizations. The film is a record of one day's activities, including a tough but authoritative drug talk by plainclothes police officers to a class of 8th graders, an evening "communication" meeting between parents and teenagers presided over by a physician, interviews by a woman doctor-counselor with young heroin and "speed" users, a visit to the Greenwich Hospital emergency room where a drug overdose victim is received, and a small discussion session where young former drug users "rap" with church teenage group members. The film is structured around the coordinating activities of the program's central office, and is designed to suggest ways in which other communities might set up similar programs.

Evaluation: *A film which could have great value in inspiring and orienting communities and local groups – PTAs, civic clubs, church and service organizations – to institute constructive programs for drug abuse prevention. The film itself received widely varying responses from committee viewers: "well-done, effective, very good," noting one faction; "superficial, blips of information, choppy and at times fragmentary," declaring another. One viewer reacted strongly to the police lecture: "An example of the worst psychology – with the opposite intention – which does much toward building anti-fuzz feelings." Although several felt the film revealed weaknesses in the program's execution, nearly all felt it offered a good design for interdisciplinary cooperation.*

Rated: *Good to very good.* **Level:** *C, A, PRO.*

Drug Abuse: The Chemical Tomb (1969)

19 min., color. *Distributor:* Film Distributors International.

A discussion of the characteristics and damaging effects when abused of depressants, stimulants, deliriants and marijuana, by Dr. John T. Burroughs, medical director of narcotics education for the Los Angeles District Attorney's Youth Advisory Council. Around this lecture are grouped scenes of teen parties, drug "dealing," hallucinatory visual effects, a police "bust" – evoking the social and legal climate in which youthful drug abuse takes place. The young person who seeks drug kicks, declares Dr. Burroughs, finds himself in an ever-increasing abyss. He finds he has lost the capability to be responsible, worthwhile and successful. The only way to avoid the reality of his failure is to take more drugs, and down he spins until he is virtually buried alive in a chemical tomb. The film concludes with emphasis on the risks to reputation and career for young people who experiment with marijuana, and argues that the ability to work for social change calls for clear minds.

Evaluation: *A ham-fisted battering of viewers with every "scare" argument against drug use available from the stereotypical arsenal. Although the lecture by Dr. Burroughs was considered reasonably calm and factual, the film was*

criticized as biased, inaccurate, dishonest and irresponsible. "Purpose is not to inform but to get kids not to take drugs," concluded one reviewer. "Many conclusions and inferences stated with absolute certainty are debatable and, in my opinion, wrong or often wrong," noted another.
Rated: *Poor to Fair.* **Level:** *J, H.*

Drug Abuse: One Town's Answer (1970)

16 min., color. *Distributor:* AIMS Instructional Media Services. *Producer:* Charles Cahill.

In 1968, rural Fort Bragg, California experienced an explosive increase in the use of drugs among its teenagers. Careful investigation revealed that this was not precipitated by drug "pushers," but that the teenagers themselves were seeking out the sources of supply. The initial reaction of the town was to toughen law enforcement and prosecution. When the adults realized that most of their own children were involved, however, they decided it was time to change the cures. Two young reformed drug users were brought in to set up a program for drug education. The program centered around an Awareness House where young people could meet to discuss their problems and find answers to their questions. The film shows the very successful Awareness House in action – teenagers openly exploring their experiences, talking about how they started using drugs (usually because of easy availability), the attractions of "speed," the quality of communication with their parents. The Chief of Police testifies to the gradual effectiveness of Awareness House in making the town's drug problem manageable. The film lays stress on the need for such avenues of frank conversation, where young people can admit their beliefs and uncertainties, exchange ideas, find willing listeners and gain strength through one another.

Evaluation: *This film, while not reviewed by the teenage committee, was considered "very good" by all adults who saw it. They did not think it gave very profound insights into the teenage mind, but praised it as valid and worthwhile for emphasizing the need for communication between parents and their children. A slickness in presentation gives the film a slightly unreal quality, and the young people seem a little stiff – not fully conveying the intimate drug involvement the film describes. The idea of an Awareness House – an extension of the drug abuse treatment program at California's Mendocino State Mental Hospital – was considered good.*
Rated: *Very good.* **Level:** *J, H, A (Parents).*

Drug Addiction (1951)

22 min., b/w. *Distributor:* Encyclopaedia Britannica Educational Corporation. *Producer:* EBEC. *Collaborator:* Joseph McVickers Hunt, Ph.D., University of Illinois and cooperation of Juvenile Protective Association of Chicago and Weibodt Foundation. *Consultant:* Andrew C. Ivy, Ph.D., M.D.

A dramatized sketch of the career of a young drug user, "Marty Demelon," who progresses from experimentation with marijuana to heroin addiction. He is arrested after pilfering a hardware store to support his $50-a-week habit – more than he earns – and sent to the federal hospital at Lexington, Kentucky, He is cured, but the prognosis is perilous once he returns to his old environment and associations. The film urges that local outpatient clinics be

established, law enforcement staffs enlarged, stricter penalties enacted against narcotics peddlers, and education programs increased to alert the public, especially young people. The film also describes, through animation, the properties and effects of opiates, marijuana and cocaine.

Evaluation: *An earnest but badly outdated effort. The acting is amateurish – which one reviewer felt at least added to the film's integrity – and Marty's story is a melodramatic cliche. "The only thing the film lacked was Leo Gorcey and Huntz Hall," scoffed another. The film has been used widely over the years, and it must be noted that a teenage girl in a more recent film cites a scene from this one – in which a boy cuts his mouth badly on a broken bottle while smoking marijuana – as responsible for making her disbelieve every warning she was thereafter to receive from official sources about drugs.*
Rated: *Average – outdated.* **Level:** *J.*

Drug Decision (1970)

30 min., color. *Distributor:* University of California Extension Media Center. *Producer:* KCET-TV.

An overview of how simulation and gaming techniques are incorporated into a multimedia approach to drug education at grade levels 7 through 9. (The course had been given to 15,000 students by 1970.) The purpose is to help students accurately learn about drugs, their uses and the problems connected with drug abuse. A studio interview with a specialist from Lockheed Education Systems describes the instruction package – a teacher's manual, student workbooks, a series of films and a Drug Attack game. The program includes a one-day teacher training session, a one-hour parent/community orientation and 15 to 20 hours of student sessions. Actual scenes filmed during the program's five phases are shown together with segments of the coordinated films used for reinforcement. Teachers are shown working with 7th grade students as they play the game. The last phase shows young ex-drug users helping addicts to rehabilitate, and explaining how they work with younger children.

Evaluation: *Not addressed to youth, this introduction to a new system for teaching about drugs is of major interest to educators. Consensus was that the purpose of teaching the facts about drugs is sound, though perhaps should begin even earlier in the 5th or 6th grades. The film lacks evaluation of the merits and/or deficiencies of the program; for instance, a "disaster" is examined for its effects on life and property and students are asked to learn methods of detecting, stopping and treating a disaster, so that later they can "defend" their community – through legal means, law enforcement and penalties – against a simulated "drug attack." This is obviously similar to Lockheed's efforts in weapon and missile defense training. The program appears to use some of the usual scare tactics (e.g., the LSD segment). The film is stilted in format and its color is poor (kinescope).*
Rated: *Good on basis of information, new approach.* **Level:** *C, A, PRO.*

Drug Safety (1964)

30 min., b/w. *Distributor:* University of Southern California. *Producers:* USC/KNXT.

A kinescope lecture from a University of Southern California *Apothecary* course series for educational television. Lecturer Dr. Edward S. Brady de-

scribes the testing, control and supervision of drug compounds and their use, from manufacture to prescription. Included are explanations of the safeguards employed during development and production, the role of independent control laboratories, the process of certification by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the use of follow-up surveys, and the inclusion of precautionary warnings on labels. Although "the administration of any drug is a carefully calculated uncertainty," he admits, and the only reliable gauge of drug safety is the clinical trial on human patients, he advises the public not to be uneasy or mistrustful. Drugs manufactured in the U.S. are the best, the safest and the most reliable in the world.

Evaluation: *An informative, if somewhat pollyannaish defense of America's best-of-all-possible pharmaceutical industries. The lecture format is extremely static, however, relieved only by the inclusion of a few still pictures from the history of pharmacology, modern lab testing, and so on. Both picture and sound on this kinescope are of inferior quality.*

Rated: *Fair – on basis of content.* **Level:** *C, A.*

Drugs and Conquest (1964)

30 min., b/w. *Distributor:* University of Southern California. *Producers:* USC/KNXT.

A kinescope lecture from a University of Southern California *Apothecary* course series for educational television. Lecturer Dr. Edward S. Brady recounts the part played by drugs in spurring exploration and conquest throughout history. The discussion ranges from the Roman legions, accompanied by explorers in search of medicinal plants, to the medieval spice trade, which was also a drug trade, to Ponce de Leon's search for the fountain of youth, inspired by ancient botanical lore. Drugs which conquered debilitating diseases also enabled colonizing armies to conquer new territories. In the Spanish American War, 300 men died in battle, 4,000 died of typhoid. Castro's ransom for the Bay of Pigs invaders was $22-million-worth of U.S. drugs. German drug patents were seized as war booty in both world wars. And a change in diet in 1884 enabled Japanese sailors to avoid beri-beri and decimate the Russian Navy only 20 years later.

Evaluation: *A meandering tour through history, interesting to those who delight in such pursuits, but not particularly germane to drug abuse education. The survey is incomplete – ignoring, for one notable example, the Opium Wars which led to Western occupation of China. Again, kinescope quality is poor.*

Rated: *Fair to poor.* **Level:** *H, C, A.*

Drugs and the Nervous System (1966)

16 min., color. *Distributor:* Churchill Films.

Animation and live film techniques are combined to illustrate the physiological and psychological effects of various drugs. From a discussion of aspirin and how it works on the body, the film proceeds to glue-sniffing, use of barbiturates, morphine, codeine, heroin, amphetamines, marijuana and LSD. There are graphic depictions of time distortion for a driver under the influence of marijuana, and of a hallucinating young LSD user who attempts to stop fast night traffic and is struck by an automobile.

20

Evaluation: *A concise, reasonably objective film of sound educational value, particularly for junior high and younger high school students. The animation is especially striking and effective. Its somewhat over-simplified explanation of pharmacology jumps to dangerous drugs without a really meaningful transition, but the explanation of addiction is well done. However, most teenage viewers expressed skepticism or antagonism to its treatment of marijuana and LSD. The film repeats the controversial claims that LSD may cause permanent brain damage, and that marijuana use is a stepping stone to harder drugs. Some technical words are misused, and there are other scientific weaknesses according to experts.*
Rated: *Very good – on basis of visual impact and general informative value.*
Level: *J, H.*

Drugs and the Very Young

See **Drugs the Children Are Choosing.**

Drugs: Facts Everyone Needs to Know (1970)

29 min., color. *Distributor:* Fiorelli Films, Inc.

A concise, blackboard-illustrated lecture in which Sanford J. Feinglass, Ph.D., director of the Center for Drug Information, Research and Education, California State College at Hayward, categorizes and briefly explains the properties of the major drugs of abuse. These include the depressants – alcohol, barbiturates, narcotics and minor tranquilizers; the stimulants – purines (tea, coffee, colas), amphetamines, cocaine and others; the psychedelics or hallucinogens – LSD, mescaline, psilocybin, DMT, and bufotenine; other mind-affecting drugs such as tobacco, scopolamine and atropine; and marijuana. Questions posed by a classroom audience of adults provide the opportunity for further discussion of problems arising from and surrounding the drug abuse controversy.

Evaluation: *The film was considered a vehicle for unusually clear, comprehensive, factual, up-to-date and authoritative information, conveyed simply and pleasantly. However, the lecture format – unrelieved except for the stiffly put questions and the summarizations in colored chalks on the blackboard – was felt to be a significant drawback. On balance, content and Feinglass' easy manner outweighed stylistic flatness.*
Rated: *Good.* **Level:** *H, C, A, PRO.*

Drugs in Our Culture

See **Drugs the Children Are Choosing.**

Drugs in the Tenderloin (1968)

52 min., b/w. *Distributor:* NET Film Service. *Producer:* KQED-TV. *Director:* Robert N. Zagone.

A candid look at drug users who live in San Francisco's Tenderloin District. These users, some homosexuals and lesbians, talk about their methods of

obtaining drugs and their reasons for using them; some discuss their ambitions for moving back into the "square" world. The interviews include vivid scenes of people trying to express themselves while under the influence of drugs. They are presented as people, not as freaks, and they say what they feel, telling about policemen who buy drugs, and the impossibility of stopping the heroin trade because it is a highly profitable big business. Mark Forrester, a staff member of the local poverty program, describes the rationalizations with which these inhabitants of the Tenderloin defend themselves – and the rationalizations by which the "straight" society ostracizes and then covertly exploits them.

Evaluation: *"Refreshing, engrossing, moving and necessary for understanding of the problem," wrote one reviewer, summarizing the committee's great respect for this film. "The film," he continued, "unlike most other drug films we've seen, was educational. I learned some things; I heard some things I never expected to hear." Although the hand-held documentary camera and on-the-spot sound techniques sometimes blur words and images, the film conveys a special sense of reality – an insight almost unique into the relationship among social conditions, deviancy, drugs and human pain.*
Rated: *Very good to excellent.* **Level:** *H, C, A.*

Drugs: The Children are Choosing
Drugs in Our Culture (1969)

30 min., color. *Distributor:* University of California Extension Media Center. *Producer:* KQED-TV. *Producer/Director:* Joanne M. Mock.

The first film in a seven-part series – takes a panoramic look at the socio-cultural setting in which "drug abuse" has aroused such a furor. "We find," notes narrator James Fadiman, "that if you ask any child aged 11 or older if he knows anyone who is using drugs, the answer is usually 'yes'." But, the film points out, drug use is part of the fabric of American life – extolled in television and radio commercials, glorified in popular music, relentlessly advertised by the nearly 8,000 samples and brochures received from pharmaceutical companies by the average doctor each year. In a series of interviews, the film reveals the breadth and difference in expert opinion about why drug use is rising among young people. These range from the failure of permissive judges to deter first-offenders, to the boredom and lack of identity in middle-class life, to the normal anxieties of adolescence, to a breakdown in communication between generations. The children *are* making choices about drugs, the film concludes. It is up to adults to prepare them to make these decisions.

Evaluation: *An ably if rather traditionally constructed sociological survey – distinguished by the clarity with which it places drug abuse in context. Such unblinking common sense is so rare in films on this subject as to carry a significant shock value. When viewed by the committee, the film contained a number of familiar television commercials which have since been deleted. The manufacturers of these products – wine, pain-relievers – nervously withdrew the permission they had originally accorded. These are not the only sore toes on which the film in its uncompromising stride, may tread.*
Rated: *Very good.* **Level:** *J, H, C, A, PRO.*

Drugs: The Children are Choosing
The Allure of Drugs (1969)

30 min., color. *Distributor:* University of California Extension Media Center. *Producer:* KQED-TV. *Production/Director:* Joanne M. Mock.

The second film in a seven-part series – examines the conflicting attitudes to various drugs taken by various societies throughout history. In ancient China, tea and marijuana were both honored as mind expanders. The religion and culture of ancient India turned on the psychedelic *soma.* Mexican shamans use hallucinogenic mushrooms, American Indians celebrate the Great Spirit through peyote, Brazilian Indians smoke intoxicating snuffs. The film also points out that periods of social change and unrest often accompany the introduction of new drugs into a society. Coffee was first proscribed by the Moslem world, then accepted as the universal beverage. Tobacco was damned by King James I of England, but demand for its cultivation brought the first slaves to America. The social tumult surrounding Prohibition of alcohol in the United States is well documented. Even the condemnation of opium smoking in the West was motivated more by 19th century racial prejudice against the Chinese – who have tolerated opium for centuries – than by innate concern for public health. Today we are in a new cycle of drug experimentation and attitudinal change. The outcome is still unknown.

Evaluation: *An uncommonly detached, artfully illustrated history lesson. Committee reviewers praised the film as concise, interesting, factual and unbiased. "A useful instrument for draining off some of the emotional exudate clouding the drug issue," wrote one. Places mankind's shifting attitudes toward drugs in historical perspective.*

Rated: *Very good to excellent.* **Level:** *J, H, C, A, PRO.*

Drugs: The Children Are Choosing –
The Pharmacology of Drugs (1969)

30 min., color. *Distributor:* University of California Extension Media Center. *Producer:* KQED-TV. *Producer/Director:* Joanne M. Mock.

The third film in a seven-part series – presents a systematic discussion of drugs and their effects by Frederick H. Meyers, M.D., professor of pharmacology, University of California, San Francisco. Among drug classes examined are the sedative-hypnotics – barbiturates, alcohol, marijuana, glue, freon; the opiates; the stimulants – meth-amphetamine, cocaine; the minor stimulants – caffeine, nicotine; and the hallucinogens – LSD, STP, etc. Dr. Meyers notes that alcohol presents by far the major abuse problem in the United States, and admits that he considers marijuana in its mild "grass" form to be less dangerous than alcohol. He declares that LSD use is now waning because the drug experience is not "fun," and urges that drug abuse education focus on the dangers of alcohol and cigarettes with an emphasis equal to that placed on other drugs. The film includes a discussion of the factors modulating the drug experience, and the gradations in use patterns – experimentation, ritual use, social use, episodic abuse, compulsive abuse.

Evaluation: *A brief, factual, comprehensive, authoritative and remarkably even-handed assessment of the relative effects and dangers of the drugs used*

and abused most frequently in America. Some reviewers felt the film attempted to cover too wide a territory in too brief a time-span, with consequent telescoping of detail. The film is a straight lecture, but use of props, camera movement and Dr. Meyer's style keep the limited format from becoming boring. "Calm, sane, fair," summarized a committee member.
Rated: *Very good – on basis of content.* **Level:** *J, H, C, A, PRO.*

Drugs: The Children Are Choosing – Drugs and the Very Young (1969)

30 min., color. *Distributor:* University of California Extension Media Center. *Producer:* KQED-TV. *Producer/Director:* Joanne M. Mock.

The fourth film in a seven-part series – suggests some reasons why a normal child in junior or senior high school may begin to experiment with drugs which are clearly disapproved of by his parents. The film opens with simulated everyday situations in which children learn from example that drugs can bring pleasure and relief. A crying baby is calmed with aspirin, a tense mother takes a tranquilizer, a couple settles down to pre-dinner cocktails. Children soon learn to imitate this behavior – furtively puffing a cigarette, sniffing glue, trying a marijuana "joint." Dr. Allen Y. Cohen, a consultant to the federal government on drug abuse, says that while such experimentation is understandable, it is not necessary. He outlines an educational approach which he thinks can be successful – a strategy based on sympathy, honesty, credibility, personal example and the suggestion of real alternatives to drug use. A 15-year-old girl recounts her drug experiences in detail, but declares that she has now stopped using drugs and "I'm even stoned-er seeing things straight."

Evaluation: *An intelligent film characterized by the clearheadedness with which this entire series was conceived. The opening vignettes were considered, in general, good, although they are obviously being improvised by non-actors. Several reviewers quarreled with the choice of situations – in particular, a happy family drinking wine with dinner. Some reviewers also expressed concern at the 15-year-old girl's claim that she gained something from her drug experience – an honest unrepentance, they worried, that could contaminate young audiences. Others felt this added to her credibility. The film's willingness to look squarely and impartially at drug use in society – without passing judgment on the propriety or impropriety.*

Rated: *Good to very good.* **Level:** *J, H, C, A, PRO.*

Drugs: The Children Are Choosing – The Need for Dialogue (1969)

30 min., color. *Distributor:* University of California Extension Media Center. *Producer:* KQED-TV. *Producer/Director:* Joanne M. Mock.

The fifth film in a seven-part series – reports on a day-long conference in which San Francisco Bay Area intermediate and junior high school students, a child psychiatrist, a minister, two school administrators, a teacher who conducts in-service training in drug education, and several teachers who are not experts on drugs seek to communicate with one another. As the camera records, the initial attempts are unsuccessful. Both children and adults are

wary, the teachers taking refuge behind their roles, the students reticent. Assessing the discussion, the experts declare that much misinformation about drugs was evident. Unexpectedly, the students ask for a special session with the child psychiatrist as discussion leader. Again the camera records – a free, easy, open exchange of ideas. The sympathetic skill of the psychiatrist allows the children to unblock. What emerges is a picture of modern childhood as complicated and frustrating as adulthood. It is no wonder, the film suggests, that young people do as we do – turn to drugs for escape and for pleasure.

Evaluation: *An interesting demonstration of generation gap dynamics, most suitable for use with parents, teachers and professionals who work with children. The film is fragmentary, reflecting the amorphous dialogue being documented. Committee reviewers were disturbed by the misconceptions about drugs the children had picked up, apparently in school. Drugs, however, are only of peripheral importance in this film about how to open lines of communication.*

Rated: *Good.* **Level:** *A, C, PRO.*

Drugs: The Children Are Choosing – What Some Communities Are Doing (1969)

30 min., color. *Distributor:* University of California Extension Media Center. *Producer:* KQED-TV. *Producer/Director:* Joanne M. Mock.

The sixth film in a seven-part series – describes two broadly-based educational efforts to deal with the problem of youthful drug abuse – the first, a program designed by the Alameda City Unified School District in the San Francisco Bay Area; the second, a community-wide interagency assault on drug abuse and its symptoms by the affluent sea-side cities of Los Angeles County's Palos Verdes Peninsula. The film describes the step-by-step construction of these programs, and interviews participants to outline their operation and achievement. "Education alone is insufficient," the film concludes, "unless by education we mean educating the whole community."

Evaluation: *A concise technical introduction to school-community drug education programming. Not recommended for general audiences, but considered useful to school officials and civic groups interested or involved in such efforts. The film does not analyze the components of the two programs it describes to any depth, but provides rather a terse outline.*

Rated: *Very good – on basis of content.* **Level:** *C, A, PRO.*

Drugs: The Children Are Choosing – What Can We Do? (1969)

30 min., color. *Distributor:* University of California Extension Media Center. *Producer:* KQED-TV. *Producer/Director:* Joanne M. Mock.

The final film in a seven-part series – looks at three different approaches to open communication between adults and the young – and among the young themselves – as they grope toward responsible decision-making about drugs and about life. In a Palos Verdes, California, eighth-grade science class, a teacher leads a "frank, open, factual and non-threatening discussion," during which his students "teach themselves about dope; I moderate." At a student-teacher conference in San Francisco, a child psychiatrist sits on the floor

among pre-teenagers, ably encouraging them to speak their minds. And at an encounter session at Damien House in San Mateo, California, college student volunteer counselors "rap" with teenagers struggling to cope with drug and family problems. Such honest, unbiased avenues of communication are essential to any effective drug abuse education program, the film declares. All sides of the drug controversy must be aired if we are going to guide the young to wise decisions.

Evaluation: *A sensible, meaningful – if somewhat unexciting – conclusion to a series called by one reviewer "probably the best drug abuse education material, in overall conception, on film."*
Rated: *Good.* **Level:** *J. H, C, A, PRO.*

The End

See **Young Film-Makers Talk About Drugs.**

Escape to Nowhere (1968)

25 min., color. *Distributor:* Professional Arts. *Producer:* David W. Parker, Ph.D. *Sponsor:* San Mateo (California) Union High School District.

A film about a real 16-year-old girl, Debbie, whose life has come to revolve around drugs. Debbie talks about the aimlessness of her wanderings, about what it is like to be a teenager in this decade, about how she was initiated into the drug culture and where it has led her. The camera records her odyssey – hitchhiking, strolling alone, playing with children in a park sandbox. Debbie's fondest wish is to be a little child again. She muses about the meanings of her experience in answer to an off-screen interviewer's questions. Scenes illustrating today's social climate are intercut: a middleaged televiewer drinking and smoking and shaking his head over youthful drug abuse; moviegoers gaping at "freaked-out hippies frolicking in the deadly fumes of marijuana." At the film's end, Debbie admits to using heroin. "Yeah, I'm in too far now," she agrees resignedly. "I think I am."

Evaluation: *An artful, highly commercial, low-key approach to drug education by probing the attitudes of one young drug user. The film received "very good" to "excellent" ratings from most adult viewers, and "good" to "very good" ratings from most of the teenagers. However, several reviewers expressed serious objections to the "biased" phrasings and "patronizing, saccharine" tone of voice of the questioner-narrator. Several also felt that the film strained to impute Debbie's loneliness and confusion – normal teenage problems – to her use of drugs. The film was praised for allowing Debbie to speak candidly, and for avoiding "scare" emphasis on arrest and addiction.*
Rated: *Very good.* **Level:** *H, A.*

Face of an Addict (1961) Restricted*

26 min., b/w. *Distributor:* Association Instructional Materials. *Producer:* Crawley Films, Ltd.

Reenactment of the actual case history of a Canadian doctor. Driven by the physical and emotional pressures of his new practice, the young physician turns to drugs (ostensibly narcotics, though the type is never specified) for temporary relief when milder sedatives fail. To manage what he believes will

be only a short period of difficulty, he attempts to maintain himself on "stabilizing doses," taken "only when he needs them." Fully aware of the danger, he nevertheless begins to realize that he is "riding a tiger." His dependence worsens, he suffers withdrawal symptoms, his nerves deteriorate and his secret is discovered by an older colleague. Prologue and epilogue describe his one-year treatment, after which he returned fully recovered to his practice. But the ready availability of drugs soon proved too great a temptation, and he eventually "went down to tragedy and self-destruction."

Evaluation: *Good progressive profile of addiction, making a point which remains highly relevant. Nevertheless, the film is badly flawed by age and by the melodramatic treatment, especially the irritatingly heavy-handed musical accompaniment. The committee questioned its impact on today's medical students and young doctors – the primary target audience. Meaningful only to those who have frequent access to drugs (doctors, nurses, pharmacists, etc.), the film offers an important warning – that professional knowledge of the dangers of drug use is no real deterrent.*

Rated: *Good – on basis of content.* **Level:** *C, A, PRO. *RESTRICTED TO MEDICAL PROFESSION.*

False Friends (1970)

9 min., color. *Distributor:* International Film Bureau, Inc. *Producer:* G. Bucklandsmith, Interfilm London Limited in association with Film Producers Guild. *Sponsor:* World Health Organization.

Through comic-strip style animation and artwork, the cycle of opiate addiction – from curiosity to semi-dependence to addiction to personal disintegration to treatment and recovery – is described. Narration is spare, and the protagonists, a young father, his wife and children, are placed in neutral settings, though the features of their faces are Asian. The father smokes opium, eventually steals from his family for heroin injections, suffers withdrawal while his children starve. But with the assistance of true friends and his loving family, he is guided to a cure. "It could have been otherwise," warns the commentary, as his fortunate outcome is contrasted with scenes showing the grim, more usual alternatives.

Evaluation: *Outstandingly successful in communicating its story and point almost without words, through the highly effective employment of animation and music. The result is necessarily oversimplified – for example, "kicking" the habit is made to seem untypically easy, and there is little evidence of motivation or precipitating problems in the addict's life – but the total impact was considered good. The film was obviously produced for use with unsophisticated viewers in foreign countries, mainly the Far East.*

Rated: *Good.* **Level:** *P, I, J, H, C, A.*

The Farthest Frontier (1967)

47 min., b/w. *Distributor:* Carousel Films. *Producer:* CBS-TV.

A report on the revolutionary new "mind drugs" and the striking effects scientists have achieved in artificially modifying brain chemistry through the administration of drugs. Included are case histories of a child saved from a life of mental retardation and the partial recovery of an apparently hopeless

psychotic. Experiments are recounted which provide examples of marked improvement in memory and concentration, as well as chemically induced fear and abnormal courage. The effects of LSD in enhancing creativity are investigated, with equivocal findings, and its use as a possible psychotherapeutic tool are noted. The film ends with a discussion of the awesome potentialities for Orwellian brain-washing and chemical manipulation of men's minds for political ends.

Evaluation: *Factual, interesting, balanced, informative. There is a slightly outdated feel about the film, and the openness toward the possibilities of LSD would probably not be reflected today. The emphasis here is much broader and more philosophical than that commonly found in drug abuse education films – which was considered a weakness by some reviewers and a useful stimulus to thought by others. Not really a drug abuse film in the standard sense, it is rather a popularized scientific report which delves into the underlying implications of chemical alteration of mental and emotional functioning.*

Rated: *Good.* **Level:** *H, C, A.*

Fight or Flight (1967)

15 min., color. *Distributor:* J&F Productions, Inc. *Produced for:* International Assoc. of Chiefs Police.

Youthful residents of Daytop Village rehabilitation center in New York, the wife of a heroin addict and the mother of a teenager who was nearly killed in an automobile accident while under the influence of LSD speak to the camera. Their experiences testify that the conflicts inevitable in life cannot be solved by drugs, and that the use of marijuana or stimulants or barbiturates or alcohol can often be habit-forming. In the case of each of these young addicts, the "soft" drugs "led" to heroin. The film cautions against succumbing to the temptation to use drugs merely because one wants to be part of the gang. "To escape from life is easy," it concludes, but everyone must make a decision: fight or flight.

Evaluation: *A smoothly produced film, but one considered to be of no special distinction. The film carefully avoids any bald statement that "soft" drug experimentation will necessarily end in heroin addiction, but it comes very close to implying this questionable claim. "It's nonsense that pot and LSD aren't habit-forming," declares one of the subjects. The implication, repeated in another scene, is that both are physically addictive. The personal testimony was felt by the committee to be generally effective, if slightly "stagey." The bridging scenes varied from dull to melodramatic. "Credible," said one reviewer, "if the two police agency titles are taken off the leader."*

Rated: *Average.* **Level:** *J, H, C, A.*

Flowers of Darkness (1968)

22 min., color. *Distributor:* National AV Center. An Airlie Production. *Executive Producer:* Murdock Head, M.D. *Producer:* Frank Cavanaugh. *Sponsors:* National Institute of Mental Health, George Washington University School of Medicine and Public Affairs, the District of Columbia Medical Society and the American Academy of General Practice. *Consultant:* Alfred M. Freedman, M.D.

An examination of the international underworld traffic in opiates, primarily heroin, the efforts to suppress it, and the socio-legal approaches to narcotics addiction. The film traces the history of opium culture and use, and describes the evolution of controlling legislation in the United States. From passage of the Harrison Act of 1914 until the enactment of the 1956 Narcotics Control Act, increasingly harsh penalties have been prescribed for those found to be in possession of opiates. But since 1966, the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act has made it easier for victims of heroin addiction to receive treatment rather than punishment. The film provides a detailed account of the steps by which a kilo of raw Turkish opium grows in value from $35 to $50,000 when sold as heroin to individual American addicts at $5 a heavily diluted "deck." Various promising approaches to addict treatment are sketched: the federal hospital at Lexington, Kentucky, Syanon, Exodus House, Daytop Village. The film draws the conclusion that unenforceable laws and stiff penalties are not the answer. Instead, it recommends a twofold attack: understanding and treatment of the addict's cycle of dependency, and a concert of nations to dry up the source of illicit drugs. Narrated by Paul Newman.

Evaluation: *A highly informative, factual and skillfully produced overview of the narcotics problem, both as Big Business and as it affects the individual. "Progressive approach, not judgmental or harsh," praised a viewer, summing up the committee's reaction. Several noted that the film was slightly fragmentary, a problem arising from the treatment of a broad subject in a brief time-span.*

Rated: *Very good.* **Level:** *H, C, A.*

From Pot to Psychedelics (1968)

32 min., b/w. *Distributor:* NET Film Service. *Executive Producer:* William Weston. *Producer:* NET Film Service.

A survey of the growing incidence in use of mind-affecting "head" drugs – as opposed to "body" drugs like heroin and methamphetamines, which are injected intravenously – in four American cities in 1967. Reporters in San Francisco, New York, Houston and Washington interview drug users, law enforcement officers, judges, sociologists, medical researchers, federal officials and drug spokesmen (i.e., Timothy Leary and Joel Fort) to compile a broad, objective picture of the national drug problem. Conclusion: it is growing, it involves a wider variety of substances, and it is not confined to any social class.

Evaluation: *Factual, realistic, comprehensive – but already outdated. Reviewers praised its fairness and success in showing a nationwide pattern, but criticized its visual emphasis on "long hairs," suggesting the problems are confined to that group – the hippies and the young. Time has also invalidated one segment of the film, a discussion of the differences in approach of the Treasury Department's Narcotics Bureau and the U.S. Food and Drug Administration. The drugabuse control activities of these two agencies have now been combined into a single Justice Department Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs. The film's point – that the drug problem is spreading – is now rather well accepted, but the opinions of the interviewees remain interesting. The film's technical quality (it is a kinescope) is below average.*

Rated: *Very good – on basis of approach and content.* **Level:** *A.*

From Runaway to Hippie (1967)

18 min., color. *Distributor:* Association Instructional Materials. *Producer:* NBC News/Cinema Verite Company.

A television documentary of the hippie movement, originally broadcast in three short segments on the NBC *Huntley-Brinkley Report.* The first segment records a teenage glue-sniffing party in Dallas, Texas, and interviews the puzzled mother of two of the participants. The second follows three of the Dallas subjects to San Francisco's Haight-Ashbury district, where the squalor, the bizarre customs and the centrality of drugs to hippie culture are emphasized. The final segment discusses rural communes, where "compatible dropouts" return to Nature, "sharing their rice, their beans, their hepatitis, their venereal disease." The impact of the hippie life-style on the wider culture is commented upon, with an ironic nod to the influence of mass media publicity such as this film.

Evaluation: *"The most overtly biased drug film we've seen," declared one committee viewer, voicing the consensus. "Rife with misinformation." Another reviewer commented: "A self-righteous film, thoroughly irritating. Every comment is a judgment. Voyeuristic – 'Watch the weirdos!' "*

Rated: *Poor.* **Level:** *A.*

Grooving (1970)

31 min., color. *Distributor:* Benchmark Films. *Producer:* Myron Solin for the New York State Narcotics Addiction Commission.

Unscripted rap sessions about drugs among a group of teenagers ranging in age from 14 to 18. In a prologue, the youths declare that if they were making a drug education film, they would like to see both sides presented, and would not like to submit to another lecture. The producers decide, therefore, simply to let them do the talking. The teenagers respond to and amplify on questions posed by the producers – expressing themselves with candor and enthusiasm. They speak about drug use – on balance unfavorably – from their own varied experiences. Some are or were drug users, others have never been. The emphasis is on marijuana, but LSD, mescaline and heroin are discussed peripherally.

Evaluation: *A film highly praised by adult viewers who were impressed by the honesty of the teenagers on camera and the unbiased attitude of the men behind it. The discussions are sometimes fragmentary and inconclusive – but useful in provoking thoughtful responses. "I've never had anyone argue with me before about drugs," says one of the film's participants. "I just ignore my parents, but when kids my own age talk to me, I have to listen and think about it." Unfortunately, the thesis could not be tested on the teenage evaluation committee, who did not see the film. Although the message is clearly anti-drug, it is conveyed reasonably, sincerely and calmly.*

Rated: *Excellent.* **Level:** *J, H.*

Hallucinogens (1964)

30 min., b/w. *Distributor:* University of Southern California. *Producers:* USC/KNXT.

A kinescope lecture from a University of Southern California *Apothecary* course series for educational television. Lecturer Dr. Edward S. Brady

discusses the growing, processing, use and effects of hashish, LSD, psilocybin, South American snuffs and mescaline. The emphasis is on chemistry and biochemical effects of the substances, although literary accounts of drug experiences are quoted. The lecture is illustrated in part by still photographs.
Evaluation: *"This particular film is highly scientific and anyone without broad understanding of chemistry would find it most boring," summarized one member for the committee. "Very limited use as educational or informative film." Kinescope quality is poor, and the lecture technique static.*
Rated: *Fair.* **Level:** *C, A, PRO.*

Hide and Seek (1966)

14 min., color. *Distributor:* Center for Mass Communications, Columbia University. *Producer/Director:* Julian Krainin.

A handsome teenage heroin addict from a middleclass background talks about his life and the effect of drugs on it. The camera records his aimless wanderings through the streets of New York City, illustrates some of his reminiscences and shows him injecting heroin. The youth says he started by smoking marijuana out of curiosity, accepted his first shot of heroin on a dare, is now unable to break the compulsion. As a result he is alienated from his family and former friends – an outsider looking wistfully at the normal world he can no longer be a part of. "I'm a louse because I keep lousing up my life," he muses. "Sometimes I think, 'Look what I lost.' I guess I missed a lot of beautiful things."

Evaluation: *Honest, authentic, but perhaps too highly personalized – and too predictable in its sentiments – to have much influence. "Could easily be interpreted by young people as 'somebody else's problem,' " declared a committee member. The movement from "soft" to "hard" drugs was brushed over too lightly, this viewer added. Another noted that the film demonstrates the technique of intravenous injection in detail. "Might cause more harm than good," he suggested. The film's visual qualities were, in general, praised, but the total impact was considered by the majority to be weak.*
Rated: *Average.* **Level:** *J, H, C, A.*

The Hippie Temptation (1967)

51 min., color. *Distributor:* McGraw-Hill. *Producer:* CBS News.

A two-part television report on San Francisco's hippie colony and the motivating impulses behind its sudden emergence – dissatisfaction with American middle-class life, the use of drugs to achieve insights – narrated by newsman Harry Reasoner. The film features interviews with a psychiatrist, the editor of an underground newspaper, the physician director of the Haight-Ashbury Free Medical Clinic, members of the rock band *The Grateful Dead,* the parents of two teenagers who "freaked out" on LSD, and the teenage drug victims themselves. The film declares at the outset that LSD holds the hippie subculture together, but emphasizes the dangers associated with use of the drug - chromosomal damage, suggestions of brain damage, psychotic reactions – and the emotional debilities of many who are attracted to the drug. The growing appeal of the hippie style is its concern with gentleness and innocence. Reasoner concludes, "but people who are old enough to grow beards and make love are supposed to move from innocence to wisdom."

Evaluation: *A film considered dated by all who saw it – hippiedom and the Haight-Ashbury district having undergone tremendous changes since the 1967 "Summer of Love" during which this footage was shot – but a film also considered provocative as a discussion-starter. The juxtaposed interviews with the baffled parents and their LSD-scarred children were felt to be particularly valuable – disturbing examples of the fact that parental concern alone is not a substitute for understanding. Several viewers criticized the film as biased: "Sets out," wrote one, "to be documentary, but makes judgments of value which are not drawn from the objective data."*
Rated: *Good – as sociological record.* **Level:** *J, H, C, A.*

Hooked (1967)

20 min., b/w. *Distributor:* Churchill Films. *Producer:* Churchill Films.

Young former drug addicts in an East Coast rehabilitation center tell, at times eloquently, of their personal experiences of addiction and their feelings about drugs. From various socio-ethnic backgrounds, they have been cured for periods ranging from three months to two years. They project an air of honest and deep personal concern as they discuss the manner in which they became addicted, the crimes this led them to, the physical effects of their grim experiences as addicts and outcasts, and what they now think about the use of narcotics. They also discuss the way addiction affected their friendships, family relations, and employment; what it feels like to be arrested; and what one goes through to kick the habit.

Evaluation: *Since the experiences related are similar, there is some repetition, but the feeling expressed by many of the young people – "I never thought I could ever really get hooked; I thought it couldn't happen to me" – gains in meaning and impact as it becomes a common denominator. Most of these young ex-addicts started with marijuana, a fact which seems to align the film on the side of the progression theory. That theory is determinedly rejected by a majority of teenagers, and has been challenged by well-documented scientific studies. However, the emphasis here is on the addictive potential of heroin. Used with other films to round out the picture of drug use and the nature of addiction, this film would lose the off-putting "scare" quality it might convey alone.*
Rated: *Good to very good.* **Level:** *J, H, C. Also youth groups (dropouts).*

House on the Beach (1968)

60 min., b/w. *Distributor:* NET Film Service. *Producer:* Rediffusion London for Intertel.

The story of the first Synanon House, the rehabilitation community for former narcotic addicts in Santa Monica, California. The film shows how the addict is admitted to Synanon, giving up all of his possessions and becoming a member of the co-operative community. The social activities of the center are explored, as well as the daily routines of maintaining the house. There are examples of the *Synanon Game,* an intensive encounter session during which the members attempt to break through the rationalizations and illusions that they use to justify their dependence on narcotics. The role of the founder of Synanon, Charles Dederich, is thoroughly explored. The group has grown from the one "house on the beach" to a nationwide organization capable of

helping thousands of people to give up the use of narcotics.

Evaluation: *Technically adroit, interesting in content, the film nevertheless left reviewers uncertain as to its applicability in drug education. It is primarily a report on the Synanon method, and secondarily a testimonial to the unusual personality of founder Dederich.*

Rated: *Good – on basis of filmic quality.* **Level:** *A, PRO. Also addict groups.*

Junky (1964)

60 min., b/w. *Producer/Distributor:* KRON-TV, Channel 4, San Francisco.

A television documentary on the problem of drug abuse, with particular emphasis on heroin addiction, the personality of the addict, and the Synanon approach to therapy. The film is divided into two parts, the first offering historical, medical, legal and sociological background, the second featuring a detailed description of Synanon theory and practice. Interviews with a judge, narcotics law enforcement officials, the founder of Synanon and a number of ex-addicts are supplemented by personal accounts of the effects of LSD, barbiturates, stimulants, marijuana and opiates. The film records such scenes as a police raid, Mexican border inspections, prison routine and "cold turkey" heroin withdrawal.

Evaluation: *Competent television journalism, but a film which is dated, uninspired and uninspiring. "Opening of film was well done; rest became progressively more melodramatic and boring. Offers cliches rather than honest attempts at understanding: 'Marijuana often leads to . . .' etc.," summarized one committee reviewer. "Who is this film for?" asked another. "Would only confirm prejudices. It doesn't enlighten."*

Rated: *Average.* **Level:** *A.*

Keep off the Grass (1969)

20 min., color. *Distributor:* Sid Davis Productions. *Producer:* Sid Davis Productions with cooperation of Santa Monica Police Department.

When Tom's mother finds some marijuana "joints" while cleaning his room, a confrontation between worried parents and son results in an agreement that Tom will at least seek out the facts before actually trying the drug. His research takes him – in company with Mac, who sold him the joints – to a college "pot party," a "head shop," the studio of a "stoned" artist, and a hippie pad. He visits a police station, where he is given "documented facts." He observed a drug arrest and the anguish it causes a family; has a near accident while driving with Mac, who is stoned; gets mugged by young drug users seeking "bread;" and watches Mac sell "grass" to an 8-year-old. He reports what he has learned to his understanding father, and announces that he has decided not to smoke marijuana after all.

Evaluation: *An unsubtle anti-marijuana film, but one which at least admits the matter is open to individual questioning and decision. In general, the committee felt that the film tried to project a calm, reasoned tone in assessing the dangers of marijuana usage (dangers only, of course). The emphasis is on the need to wait for more hard scientific knowledge before personal experimentation. On the other hand, the commentary was considered preachy and irritating, and the parade of unfavorable situations too zealous. "Will be great*

for reinforcing adult misconceptions," declared a committee member, a church youth-club president. "Kids will only laugh at it."
Rated: *Average.* **Level:** *J, H, C, A.*

The Law: How Effective Is It? (1968)

36 min., b/w. *Distributor:* NET Film Service. *Producer:* NET, KCET-TV. *Producer/Director:* Tom Burrows.

A lively discussion about the current marijuana laws by a panel featuring a former narcotics officer with the Los Angeles police force, a social psychiatrist, an attorney, and two medical doctors. These informed and concerned men grapple with such legal aspects as whether marijuana is really a narcotic and whether a causal relationship exists between the use of marijuana and violence. The discussion covers a broad range of questions, including the role of the mass media in publicizing drugs, and the propriety of government efforts to regulate private morality. The general conclusion of the panel is that today's marijuana laws are ineffective. The panel includes Joseph Oteri, a Boston attorney; Dr. Joel Fort, social psychiatrist; Dr. William Quinn, spokesman for the California Medical Association; and others.

Evaluation: *At times this fast-moving debate grows so heated that it nearly crumbles into chaos – accurately reflecting, noted one reviewer, the vast confusion prevailing where marijuana is concerned. All sides are represented, no specific alternatives can be hammered out by these opinionated men, but the various theses are voiced articulately. Intelligent, thought-provoking.*

Rated: *Excellent.* **Level:** *C, A, PRO.*

Life in New York

See **Young Film-Makers Talk About Drugs.**

LSD (1967)

28 min., color. *Distributor:* National AV Center. *Producer:* U.S. Navy developed by Surgeon General's Office.

A stand-up lecture on the history, pharmacological properties and physical and psychological effects of the drug lysergic acid diethylamide. Lt. Cdr. Walt Miner, U.S. Navy Medical Corps, presents a detailed analysis of the time sequence of an LSD trip, but stresses the unpredictability of individual reactions; the resemblance between the LSD experience and certain forms of insanity, the possibility of recurrent hallucinations (flashback), the risk of permanent psychosis, suicide, genetic damage, and the future unreliability of anyone who has ever used the drug – especially under the strain of complex military tasks or battle conditions.

Evaluation: *"Confused, almost totally distorted and inaccurate, propagandistic, and likely to increase drug use among enlisted men and young people," declared an adult committee member. "Purpose is to scare the hell out of sailors," noted another. The teenage responses were similarly critical: "It greatly influenced my decision on whether or not I will take it again." a 17-year-old wrote. "The film only seemed to be talking to those who have not taken LSD, and made those that have taken it feel that they were beyond help. It should have spent more time trying to encourage them to stop."*

Particularly poignant was this comment, scrawled on the back of a teenager's evaluation sheet: "I feel that anyone (army, navy, government) that deals in war is insane, not people who look for peace of mind, even if LSD is a chemically-produced high."

Rated: *Fair.* **Level:** *H, C, A, PRO. (Navy personnel).*

LSD – Insight or Insanity (1968)

(Revised Edition)

28 min., color. *Distributor:* Bailey/Film Associates. A Medi-Cine Production. *Producer/Director:* Max Miller of Avanti Films. *Writers:* Richard S. Scott, M.D. and Max Miller.

Eight doctors and a pharmacologist involved in LSD research explain that the drug remains an unknown quantity and that its unsupervised use is extremely dangerous. The film opens with a good-natured look at teenage faddism such as hippie clothing and hair styles, then moves to less socially desirable fads such as gang fights, "chicken" contests, and drug experimentation. The possibility that LSD exercises damaging genetic effects on human beings is emphasized. This contention is illustrated by scenes of deformed foetuses carried by guinea pigs that were dosed with LSD in pregnancy, along with photos of chromosomal breaks and abnormalities associated with human LSD ingestion. The film closes with former U.S. Food and Drug Commissioner James L. Goddard warning that LSD experimentation is like playing Russian roulette. A game of Russian roulette is dramatized, and in the film's final scene, the gun fires. Narrated off-camera by actor Sal Mineo.

Evaluation: *A well-produced film with excellent color effects and illustrative material for the scientific findings – but a film whose heavy-handed tone and emphasis on shock effects turned off many viewers. "Reminds one of the temperance lectures of the 19th Century," suggested an adult committee member. The terminology is occasionally rather technical, and could give rise to confusions among younger viewers. Many committee members questioned the authority given to the still-uncorroborated scientific data, and noted that the film treats LSD-use as though it were a recent phenomenon – which it was when the film was made. There was a wide variance in response among both the adult and teenage committees, some finding the film very good, others rating it as poor. On balance then . . .*

Rated: *Average.* **Level:** *J, H.*

LSD: Lettvin Vs. Leary (1968)

51 min., b/w. *Distributor/Producer:* NET Film Service.

A debate about LSD and marijuana usage by advocate Timothy Leary, former Harvard psychology professor, and dissenter Jerome Lettvin, former practicing psychologist and now Professor of Physiology at MIT. Excerpts from experimental films are shown while Leary espouses the "sacramental" use of LSD to return to cosmic knowledge and oneness with the universe – an ability which has been lost by Western man. Lettvin attacks LSD as a possible cause of irreversible alterations in brain functioning, and chastizes users for abrogating their critical, rational, judgmental responsibilities. He points out the similarity of LSD effects to those caused by certain types of brain lesions. The debate was filmed for television at MIT.

Evaluation: *A stimulating and absorbing philosophical discussion between two articulate men. Each is a persuasive advocate for essentially irreconcilable positions: Lettvin the rationalist, Leary the mystic. Depending on their biases, the committee members worried about the seductiveness of Leary's appeal . . . or criticized the fact that Lettvin is accorded the final word. All, however, praised the film as intelligent and thought-provoking at the most meaningful level of drug education. (See also:* **Professor Lettvin Tuned In.)**

Rated: *Good to very good.* **Level:** *H, C, A, Religious groups.*

LSD: The Other Side of Reality (1964)

21 min., color. *Distributor:* KRON-TV. *Producer:* J. Culp.

An examination into the effects of LSD and its potential therapeutic uses in the field of mental health, featuring interviews with California researchers, clinicians and a rabbi. The film – a documentary production in the *Assignment Four* series of San Francisco's KRON-TV – records the supervised LSD "trip" of a young woman volunteer at the San Mateo County Hospital. She describes her drug experience in part, and the aims of the experiment are commented upon by psychiatrist Joseph J. Downing, M.D. The achievements, failures, promises and risks involved in use of LSD in such settings are further elucidated by psychiatrists from the Palo Alto Mental Research Institute, the Palo Alto Veterans' Administration Hospital, and the Mendocino State Hospital. The religious ecstacies – or perhaps nightmares – sometimes induced by LSD, and the implicit dangers in its potential for brain-washing, are also subjects under discussion.

Evaluation: *An interesting, intelligent and objective presentation of then-current (1964) psychiatric opinions – conflicting – about the good and bad effects of LSD. Cinematography was considered excellent, but the sound track annoyingly fuzzed many of the comments of the young woman describing her LSD perceptions. "Too much talk," a viewer added, summarizing the committee's main complaint about the film. Another suggested that the information may no longer reflect best scientific thinking. But in showing both sides, noted a 16-year-old, "it leaves leeway for the individual to see the sides clearly."*

Rated: *Good.* **Level:** *H, C, A, PRO.*

LSD: The Spring Grove Experiment (1966)

54 min., b/w. *Distributor:* McGraw-Hill. *Producer:* CBS News.

A report on the therapeutic use of LSD under controlled conditions at Spring Grove State Mental Hospital, Baltimore, Maryland. The film documents the program through two subjects, a 48-year-old housewife who suffered an acute emotional breakdown and a 33-year-old male alcoholic. Their preparation – intensive psychometric testing and conventional psychotherapy; their LSD treatment – one 14-hour session in a carefully supervised setting; and their subsequent return to useful life are depicted. The two case studies illustrate the effect of LSD in promoting an emotional release of feelings which psychiatry has helped them to understand on an intellectual level. Although still experimental when this film was made, the researchers in charge of the program express hopes that further study will prove LSD can be of medical

value. While warning of the dangers of indiscriminate use of the drug, psychiatrist Joel Elkes, M.D., of John Hopkins University, argues that "we should not let the negative be emphasized so much that the positive aspects are swamped."

Evaluation: *Good television journalism, interesting, informative but now outdated. The committee praised the film's circumspection about the conclusions which could be drawn from this very limited test; nevertheless, they feared that general audiences might still "overinterpret" the value of LSD in such cases. "If shown, should be augmented by discussion of work done since," suggested a viewer. Teenagers found the film objective and convincing, but slow moving.*

Rated: *Good to very good.* **Level:** *H, C, A, PRO.*

LSD, Trip – Or Trap! (1968)

20 min., b/w and color. *Distributor/Producer:* Sid Davis Productions with cooperation of Inglewood (California) Police Department.

Bob and Chuck are high school chums – inseparable until the day Chuck is coaxed into trying LSD. Bob decides to study the available literature on the drug before taking any chances with it. His reading at the local library convinces him that LSD is extremely dangerous. But before he can warn Chuck, tragedy strikes. While driving his girl-friend home from an "acid" party, Chuck experiences a 'flashback." The automobile overturns, Chuck is killed, his girl friend badly injured. Among the facts Bob learned about LSD are these: its lethal dose is unknown; it may cause chromosomal damage, birth deformities, premature aging, cancer, leukemia, brain damage, self-inflicted injuries, suicide, murder; users are immature, unstable, listless, indifferent, morbidly introspective; LSD is not habit forming . . . but worse, the user becomes psychologically hooked; it is illegal, thus manufactured under unsanitary conditions and promoted by organized crime; youthful abusers risk arrest and death, shame, grief for their families; LSD users must often resort to theft to pay for their illicit escape.

Evaluation: *The most charitable viewer rated this film "fair," but that judgment was offset by another who created his own category – "atrocious." The film was considered biased, distorted, unbelievable, embarrassingly stupid, melodramatic, preachy, pseudo-scientific, propagandistic and an insult to the intelligence. "Designed for immature audiences – to provoke shock and generate only an emotional response," wrote one committee member, voicing the consensus. "Propagates myth, falsehoods, gross exaggerations."*

Rated: *Poor.* **Level:** *H.*

LSD: The Trip to Where? (1968)

25 min., color. *Distributor:* McGraw-Hill. *Producer:* WABC-TV. *Producer:* Tim Knight.

A survey of the controversy surrounding LSD, featuring interviews with Timothy Leary, Sidney Cohen, M.D., cytogeneticist Dr. Maimon Cohen – who first reported chromosomal breaks associated with LSD – other medical authorities, and a young New York actor who set himself afire in Central Park while under the drug's influence. The sum of the medical opinion expressed here is to the effect that LSD is extremely dangerous – more harmful even

than heroin, according to one psychiatrist – and related to genetic injury, psychosis, suicide and murder.

Evaluation: *Well-produced, interesting television journalism – but a film badly flawed. Many of the medical claims are given an authoritative weight out of proportion to the true state of research, according to committee experts, and the sensational baring of his horribly burned face by the young actor was thought more likely to turn off than dissuade viewers. Worse, this supposedly ultimate warning is followed by an admission that the producer himself tried LSD in the course of making the film. He had a good trip, he says, but is now convinced the dangers far exceed the possible benefits. Nevertheless, the subtle message, several reviewers feared, is that one must try the drug for himself in order to make up his mind.*
Rated: *Average.* **Level:** *H, C, A.*

LSD–25 (1967)

27 min., color. *Distributor:* Professional Arts. *Producer:* David W. Parker, Ph.D.

The voice of the LSD-25 molecule narrates this film – explaining its properties and acknowledging the dangers attendant upon use. Dramatic scenes portray various aspects of the controversy over LSD, and the experiences of those who use. The film emphasizes such dangers as the fact that the drug is illegal, its effects are unpredictable, the dosages bought on the street are uncertain, it is astonishingly potent, and it has been associated with such disquieting signs as altered brain wave tracings and damaged chromosomes among users.

Evaluation: *Although this film is not perfect – a bit garish, a bit melodramatic – it does manage to avoid the wretched excesses which the subject has often inspired in filmmakers. It is visually interesting, and conveys a great deal of solid, understandable information. The argument against use of LSD turns more on what is unknown and unpredictable about the drug than on a recital of "scare" gindings. Nevertheless, some viewers voiced reservations about the tone, and about a certain ambiguity arising from the personification of LSD.*
Rated: *Very good.* **Level:** *J, H, C, A.*

The Losers (1965)

31 min., b/w. *Distributor:* Carousel Films. *Producer:* WCBS-TV.

An examination of the phenomenon of drug use and abuse, especially among the young, produced by CBS News. The investigation reveals that drug use cuts across social and economic lines, and includes interviews with slum youths, teenagers from "nice" neighborhoods, and authorities on various aspects of the problem. The film notes that police estimate 35 percent of all drug experimenters will get "hooked" on heroin, and underlines the danger with a visit to the New York City morgue, where the body of an overdose victim is shown. The harmful effects of glue-sniffing, use of pep pills, goofballs and marijuana are also discussed.

Evaluation: *A factual but heavily slanted, somewhat superficial journalistic report which is showing its age. "Sensationalizes drug use; makes it scary and probably attractive to anyone bent on self-destruction; narration highly*

biased and judgmental; dated: pre-psychedelics," reacted one viewer. Others felt its integrity as a document could make it fairly useful.
Rated: *Average.* **Level:** *J, H, C, A.*

The Mad Chemist (1969)

10 min., color. *Distributor/Producer:* Professional Arts. *Producer/Director/Writer:* David W. Parker, Ph.D. Produced in association with Hillsborough, Ca. City School District.

To a sound-track accompaniment of doggerel verse, a "mad chemist" creates a green-skinned Frankenstein monster which he hooks up to a "happiness machine." Into the machine he feeds various drugs – with uniformly disappointing results. The effects of barbiturates, glue- and gasoline-sniffing, and marijuana are demonstrated in the reactions of the monster. Bypassing heroin, opium and cocaine, the chemist has only LSD left. But the monster "didn't really want to know who he was," and wrecks the laboratory in a fit of rage. Apologetic, the chemist admits, "Drugs don't do all of the things that they say. Real happiness just can't be bought this way."

Evaluation: *An imaginative attempt to demonstrate the futility of finding happiness through chemical means – but a signal failure. The poetry is off-putting, the pseudo-machine far too cheaply constructed, and no alternative methods of finding the happiness one seeks are suggested. The actual information conveyed about drugs is very sketchy, with the exception of the barbiturates. "Would likely produce lots of laughs, but few converts," summarized one reviewer.*
Rated: *Fair to poor.* **Level:** *I, J.*

Marathon: The Story of Young Drug Users (1967)

51 min., b/w. *Distributor:* Films, Inc. *Producer/Writer:* Ernest Pendrell. *Director:* Walker Stuart.

The documentary camera records highlights from a 30-hour "marathon" encounter session among young drug addicts undergoing voluntary treatment at New York's Daytop Village. Dr. Efran Ramirez, coordinator of drug addiction agencies in New York, comments on the meaning of the individual dramas unfolding in this pressure-cooker atmosphere, and describes the theory behind the marathon encounter method. The stories of five Daytop residents are highlighted in the film: Charlie and Eileen, a young married couple, both of whom are addicts; Seena, who is only 20 years old; Judy, 23-year-old daughter of a prominent surgeon; and Roger, a former college student. "Marathons are just life – meaningless at times, but meaningful when we start to relate to one another as people," declared Dr. Ramirez. The final sequence shows a corpse being delivered to the morgue – one of the victims of the recent 600 percent increase in deaths among New York City heroin addicts.

Evaluation: *"An excellent film both on techniques of group therapy and on the nature of drug abuse problems," wrote a reviewer, summing up the committee reaction. "Dramatic in its simplicity and its reality. Could be an effective training film for therapists or an educational film for students of drug*

abuse." The committee praised the film's technical quality, both picture and sound.

Rated: *Very good to excellent.* **Level:** *C, A, PRO.*

Marijuana (1968)

34 min., color. *Distributor:* Bailey/Film Associates. *Producers:* Max Miller and Avanti Films.

Probably the first major film effort to center upon the use and possible risks of marijuana. Attempts to appear fair and unbiased and present opposing arguments in order to let the young viewer decide for himself. A "pot" party in a lavishly furnished middle class home is invaded by grim, uncomprehending police officers who hustle the handcuffed teenagers into patrol cars. As each passes the camera, he yells out some popular justification for smoking and for legalizing marijuana. The on-camera commentator, Sonny Bono, isolates each of these in review and presents counter arguments. These include the risk of a bum trip, immaturity invites emotional drug dependency, marijuana may lead to use of stronger drugs, its influence affects physical and mental states preventing good performance of critical tasks, it could lead to suicide, and nearly universal laws prohibit its use for the common welfare. To "prove" marijuana is dangerous and worse than tobacco or alcohol (the film admits these are legal but frequently abused) inmates of a California narcotic rehabilitation center give their opinions. These appear to attribute all kinds of drug addiction to marijuana. The film ends with a sequence of attractive, conventional-looking young people addressing the camera to recommend that everyone should be "straight," should come to grips with society's problems, without the use of drugs. Sonny concludes by reminding each viewer that "It's your life," and "It's up to you to decide."

Evaluation: *Though this ambitious film purports to talk straight to its youthful target audience, to be fair and present reasonable arguments, it fails in a multitude of ways. Only the most naive and gullible will comfortably agree with this film, probably the fifth grade level or younger. Intended as an idol speaking to his admirers, Sonny Bono (of "Sonny and Cher" fame) tends to turn off most young people. About the only attractive thing in the film is the possible pleasure marijuana smoking would seem to provide (this gives a little credence to some of the justifications for using marijuana), and by virtue of this, its use begins to appear in a better light than the colored and overly dramatized arguments for its prohibition. The performance of the unsympathetic police officers cannot fail to ally a teenage audience instantly with what they observe to be young victims of an unjustifiable intrusion. Since the film blatantly claims to be objective and present both sides so that one may choose, but proceeds mainly to oppose the use of marijuana, it is basically dishonest and the sophisticated adolescent who may be attracted to (or already using) marijuana will not be dissuaded. The treatment of this film depends upon contrasting efforts to shock (some very overdone) so that its considerable impact is in directions far removed from either education or persuasion. Ironically, its final plea "It's your life. It's up to you to decide." are arguments very often used to justify pot smoking by its defenders.*

Rated: *Average.* **Level:** *J, H.*

Marijuana (CBS Reports) (1968)

52 min., b/w. *Distributor:* Carousel Films. *Producer:* Harry Morgan, CBS News.

This film study takes a reasoned look at the many facets of the marijuana problem by going directly to primary sources – government officials, medical and research personnel, and law enforcement agencies, but above all the younger people involved in the "youth crisis" in the country. CBS News Correspondent Mike Wallace points out that in just a few short years marijuana has created a national controversy which involves Congress, the American Medical Association, police and the courts, schools, parents, and children. Interviewed in the film are high school students from Ithaca, N.Y., ex-addicts from New York City's Phoenix House, a college-educated career girl in her mid-20's who tells why she smokes marijuana, and others from various backgrounds and viewpoints. The film draws the conclusion that existing penalties for marijuana use are too severe, and calls for a rational rather than an emotional approach to the problem.

Evaluation: *An unusually comprehensive and intelligent view of the marijuana controversy as seen from both the pro and the con sides. Students unanimously found it "very good" or "excellent," probably because of its care to be balanced, accurate (with only minor exceptions) and authoritative in an unbiased way – even if one was drawn to comment: "Does not have the courage to say alcohol is worse." The rare tone of impartiality was appreciated by the adults, who praised the emphasis on the judicial and research aspects.*

Rated: *Very good to excellent.* **Level:** *H, C, A.*

The Maze: Haight-Ashbury (1967)

25 min., color. *Distributor/Producer:* KPIX/TV.

The documentary camera records hippie-life style in the Haight-Ashbury district of San Francisco during its zenith in 1967. The sympathetic tour guide is poet-playwright Michael McClure, author of *The Beard,* a rehearsal of which is shown, along with other elements in the social and intellectual pattern of hippie living. Included are bits of performances and interviews with rock bands; visits to the business enterprises of the district – "head" shops, bookstores, print and pottery shops, a "hip" job cooperative; a talk with a psychedelic painter; a glimpse into the home-life of *The Grateful Dead.* McClure notes that "new rituals" are coming into being: baking bread, berry-picking, wearing rich cloths like velvet, mysticism and "the laugh of the body." The use of drugs, sexual excesses and crime are admitted to exist, but the film suggests that they may be no more prevalent in this neighborhood than in other parts of the city.

Evaluation: *A biased view of hippiedom – but one which, for a change is biased in a favorable skew. The film was praised for its obvious authenticity, but criticized as superficial and now outdated. "Designed to show some of the things attracting young people to the Haight and some of the creative aspects of life there," wrote one reviewer. "Not a drug film per se, but good for perspective." Said another: "Directed at adult attitudes in hopes of changing them toward greater understanding and tolerance for the positives in the hippie experience."*

Rated: *Good to very good.* **Level:** *H, C, A.*

41[illegible]

The Mind Benders — LSD and the Hallucinogens (1968)

26 min., color. *Distributor:* Public Health AV Facility *Producer:* Vision Associates. *Sponsor:* U.S. Food and Drug Administration.

A documentary report on the current state of knowledge about hallucinogenic drugs, chiefly LSD, featuring interviews with noted medical authorities as well as youthful experimenters who recount their experiences and the effects the drug has had on them. The film cites the following hard facts: LSD is extremely potent, but its perception-altering mechanism remains uncertain; it has caused abnormal fetuses and premature births in one study conducted on five guinea pigs; it has been associated with chromosomal breaks in human users, but the significance has not yet been established; and it may cause psychological dependency in some users. The risks of "bum trips," "flashbacks" and an impulse to drop out of conventional society are noted. On the other hand, possible medical uses for the drug in treating alcoholics, the mentally ill and terminal cancer patients (adjustment to death) are reported. The first-hand accounts of the young users vary, some extolling the insights they gained, others telling of painful psychic ordeals. "The evidence is inconclusive," the film declares. However, "the facts suggest caution and a careful counting of the cost."

Evaluation: *An unusually well-balanced, judicious and objective survey, placing the film far above most others dealing exclusively with LSD. "I was amazed, considering the Food and Drug Administration made it," wrote a wary viewer. Technical quality (the film alternates sequences in black-and-white and in color) was considered excellent. "Highly imaginative in its photographic art, particularly when describing the hallucinations produced by the drug," wrote a committee member, echoing others.*
Rated: *Good to very good.* **Level:** *J, H, C, A.*

Mindscape (1967)

8 min., b/w. *Distributor:* Univ. of So. Calif. *Producer/Director:* Stuart Muller. *Cameramen:* Don Fox, Ernest Sanders, Ron Sparks.

A student production, this short film attempts to depict the hallucinogenic effect of LSD. Two men — one white, one black — share a drug tablet in an apartment living room. The former begins to see visions of cattle being slaughtered. Soon the vision changes, and he imagines himself being led from a cattle holding-pen. He erupts in a burst of anger at his companion, rushes out of the room, flees down halls and stairways, and ends floating upside down in the depths of a turbulent pool of water. The hallucinatory sequences are intercut with dialogue between the two men, some of it containing mild profanities.

Evaluation: *An interesting exercise in experimental cinematic techniques, but — like the works in the series YOUNG FILM-MAKERS TALK ABOUT DRUGS — a film more valuable for its hints at what young people have on their minds these days than for its contribution to the body of knowledge about drug abuse. The sound track is poorly synchronized in places.*
Rated: *Average.* **Level:** *H, C, A.*

42ip

A Movable Scene (1968)

22 min., color. *Distributor:* National AV Center. An Airlie Production. *Executive Producer:* Murdock Head, M.D. *Producer:* Frank Cavanaugh. *Sponsors:* National Institute of Mental Health, George Washington University School of Medicine and Public Affairs, the District of Columbia Medical Society and the American Academy of General Practice. *Consultant:* Alfred M. Freedman, M.D.

A survey of the international youth scene as it turns on drug use, religious searching and protest. Principal stops are California, New York, New Orleans, London, Istanbul and Kathmandu. The film examines the universal common denominator, the use of marijuana, declares that LSD use is on the downswing now, replaced by "meditation and methedrine." A mass arrest at a youth music festival, glowering motorcycle gang members, interviews with a young girl who uses "speed," an English father whose son died of a heroin overdose, a youth-scorning California minister, a UCLA physician who pleads for adult tolerance – all graphically illustrate the current social setting. *The camera focuses on commune dwellers in rural* America and American hippie pilgrims in Nepal. There is a basic discontent with Establishment values among young people today, the film concludes. "They are all putting us down, and it is universal." But society must listen to what they are saying. "We as straight society must reach out to them and help." Narrated by Robert Mitchum.

Evaluation: *A useful and uncommonly wide-ranging introduction for adults to the current youth culture, its underpinnings and directions. "A good analysis of the total 'drug scene,' " summarized one committee member. "Might not be accepted completely by the 'hip' community itself because it seems to attempt to give straight society's interpretation of 'where it's at.' " Several viewers felt that the film could become outdated very quickly, and several wondered at the choice of narrator – Robert Mitchum, here representing the Establishment, who once (very long ago) had his own highly publicized brush with the law over marijuana. The final advice to adults – to listen, and talk and to offer meaningful alternatives to the discontented young – was considered unimpeachable.*

Rated: *Good to very good.* **Level:** *H, C, A.*

Narcosis (1958)

23 min., color. *Distributor:* California Peace Officers Association. *Producer:* Golden State Productions under the supervision and direction of the California Bureau of Narcotics Enforcement.

A training film for police officers describing the processing and use of marijuana and heroin, and the withdrawal symptoms of heroin addiction. Detailed depictions of narcotics paraphernalia and their use are included to enable the viewer to readily identify this equipment in the field.

Evaluation: *Melodramatic music and narration, simplistic logic and glorification of drug injection were some of the aspects of the film criticized by committee viewers. Provides one of the most complete and harrowing, perhaps even sadistic, studies of withdrawal – filmed during supervised treatment of an actual addict – available on acetate.*

Rated: *Poor.* **Level:** *PRO.*

Narcotics and Kids (1969)

9 min., color. *Distributor:* Newenhouse/Novo. *Producer:* Sandler Institutional Films. *Director:* Beryl Gelford.

Two attractive young women, former drug users, answer questions posed by a class of pre-junior high school children. They emphasize that drug-takers are usually weak people, lonely and insecure and anxious to follow the crowd. The children ask such questions as: Where do drugs come from? What are junkies? Are drugs worse than alcohol? Do pushers turn kids on to drugs? The replies are brief, and the film ends with a train of other questions to indicate the need for communication about drugs even at this early level.

Evaluation: *Too short and generalized to provide very much real information. The questions are naive, the answers vague, sometimes confusing and occasionally unresponsive. The film is intended as a vehicle to open discussions, an indicator that young children of today are not insulated from concern about drugs. But, summarized one reviewer, the film is not itself likely to be very satisfying.*

Rated: *Average.* **Level:** *I, J.*

Narcotics: A Challenge to Youth/Teachers (1956)

25 min., color and b/w. *Distributor:* Narcotic Educational Foundation of America. *Executive Producer:* Henry B. Hall with financial aid assistance from the National Woman's Relief Corps, Auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic, Inc. *Producer/Director:* Gilbert Lasky. *Writer:* Ronald Austin.

A brief discussion of the classes and properties of the various "narcotics" – opiates, marijuana, cocaine and the dangerous drugs (barbiturates, amphetamines) – coupled with a dramatized sketch of the "typical pattern" of youthful drug abuse. The typical pattern, the film declares, usually begins in the poorer neighborhoods, where an immature, self-pitying, easily frustrated boy with a problem experiments with marijuana. Delinquency, gambling, truancy and theft are often part of the pattern, too. From marijuana, the typical abuser usually looks for bigger kicks, and progresses through "goofballs" and "bennies" to heroin. He will be arrested, undergo painful withdrawal, serve prison time and return to his former surroundings, where he will usually become "hooked" again. However, concludes the film, "Education, for some, could be immunization. Remember, don't exaggerate. The facts are terrible enough. Your community counts on you." Narrated by Lowell Thomas.

Evaluation: *A sensationalized, inaccurate, dated and dangerously ineffectual film, the committee agreed. The purpose, suggested one reviewer, is to "scare teachers into scaring students about narcotics." Wrote another: "The worst of this film was its obvious contempt for addicts, which any young audience is likely to respond to with resentment." A third summarized the committee's opinion: "Should be regarded as obsolete."*

Rated: *Poor.* **Level:** *H, A, PRO.*

Narcotics: The Decision (1961)

30 min., color. *Distributor:* Association Instructional Materials. *Producer:* Film Distributors International.

"This is the story," the narrator announces, "of a junkie, a hype. It is the story of this girl's 18-year journey into Hell." The film opens with animation

446

depicting the operation of the human brain. Then dramatization recounts the girl's career: experimentation with alcohol, use of barbiturates at a teen party, progress to marijuana under the tutelage of a "pusher," graduation to heroin, eventual addiction, recourse to theft and prostitution to finance her habit, the slaying of a pharmacist during an armed robbery, arrest and agonizing withdrawal from addiction in a jail cell. Descriptions of the effects of various drugs are interwoven with the narrative. Heroin preparation and injection are illustrated in detail.

Evaluation: *An overdrawn, melodramatic historical curiosity. Clothing styles seriously date this film, and much of the information it conveys is at least misstated, if not in error. For example, the film speaks of marijuana addiction. "Students would just laugh," a committee member noted.*
Rated: *Poor.* **Level:** *J, H.*

Narcotics – The Inside Story (1967)

12 min., color. *Distributor:* Aims Instructional Media. *Producer:* Charles Cahill and Associates.

Teenagers having fun on the beach, surfing, eating hotdogs illustrates how we enjoy life through our five senses and central nervous system. But drugs – depressants or stimulants – can harm from within. Under controlled use by a doctor's prescription, these drugs are beneficial. But other drugs are not used medically: marijuana, which can lead to desire for other drugs, and LSD, which is physically dangerous. The effects of depressants are shown on laboratory rats – walking is difficult, climbing impossible. A montage graphically intersperses drugged people and drugged rats. A young man, arrested and jailed for having drugs, is contrasted with those young people sporting on the beach. Just as we can be hurt from the outside, we can be hurt from within (the inside story). So drugs should be used only if one is ill, and only with the prescription of a physician.

Evaluation: *A very basic and superficial film – useful, perhaps, for the lower grades. Certainly the teenagers who reviewed it were unimpressed. The film lacks imaginative treatment, and is overly simple in its narrative tone, as well as its drug classification. The implications about marijuana and LSD are inaccurate as presented.*
Rated: *Average.* **Level:** *I, J.*

Narcotics: Pit of Despair (1967)

28 min., color. *Distributor:* Film Distributors International. *Producer:* Mel Marshall.

John Scott, handsome high school athlete, owner of a racy sports car, has problems. His grades are poor, for one thing, so he begins taking pills to enable him to study. But he is also a procrastinator, so instead of studying he goes to a party. There he drinks beer, smokes cigarettes and succumbs to the blandishments of a beautiful female marijuana pusher, who urges on him his first "joint." Soon he becomes psychologically dependent on the drug, fails in his studies, is dropped from the track team. A bearded friend coaxes him to try heroin. He becomes addicted, pilfers from his home to pay for narcotics, experiences withdrawal, is betrayed to the police and sentenced to a government rehabilitation hospital. But, upon release, he once again looks up his addict friends. "There is no end," the film declares at fade-out.

Evaluation: *An updated variation of NARCOTICS: THE DECISION, this film offers only slight improvements. Again the preparation and injection of heroin are graphically detailed, and again the drama is distorted and cliche-ridden. Several adult viewers, while criticizing the film as stereotypical melodrama, nevertheless wondered whether it might not strike some responsive chords among affluent white high school students. On the other hand, a psychiatrist suggested: "Makes drugs more inviting. The tone of subdued excitement would, I predict, have the opposite to desired effect." The teenage committee did not see the film.*
Rated: *Average.* **Level:** *J, H.*

Narcotics Trade (1964)

27 min., color. *Distributor/Producer:* Oceania Productions.

A documentary on the production and use of opium and its various by-products, with emphasis on the historical and economic origins of the drug trade in the Far East. Camera crews visit remote poppy fields in the mountains of Thailand and Laos, major urban centers for the distribution of narcotics in Asia. Harvesting and preparation of raw opium by nomadic Meo tribesmen and the purchase by a buyer from "civilization" is shown, as well as opium-smoking and efforts to police it in Singapore and Hong Kong. Methods by which opium is converted into heroin and morphine are illustrated, together with the various means of smuggling narcotics into Europe and America. Notes United Nations efforts to stamp out illicit opium poppy cultivation, and efforts at law enforcement and addict rehabilitation throughout the world.

Evaluation: *An interesting travelogue marred by extremely poor narration, harsh musical accompaniment and disjointed continuity. "Nice shots of the elephants and village life," noted one reviewer wryly, singling out the only aspect of the film praised by the committee. Indeed, the authentic, quite rare sequences of remote Asian tribesmen, their poppy cultivation and processing, as well as authentic scenes of opium smoking in Asian capitals give this film some ethnographic value. But the concensus was that the film is biased and does little to advance understanding.*
Rated: *Fair.* **Level:** *I, H, C, A.*

Narcotics — Why Not? (1965)

15 min., color. *Distributor:* Aims Instructional Media. *Producer:* Charles Cahill and Associates.

Sixteen young residents of the California Rehabilitation Center at Corona — a state penal institution — speak of their experiences as drug users, eventual heroin addicts, and currently prisoners. Dramatic episodes provide a counterpoint: the desperate search for a "fix," stealing for drug money, being arrested and handcuffed. The subjects talk about the unpleasantness of the drug-centered life and the consequent risk of loss of freedom. They come from a variety of social and ethnic backgrounds and, though they earnestly recount the horrors of addiction and imply that they are through with drugs, statistics tell another story. A full 94 percent of the addicts released from Corona after treatment return to heroin within six months.

Evaluation: *The interviews are straight-forward, but the bridging scenes are dramatically weak and the narration pounds at the audience in a moralistic tone. Adult committee members criticized the film as superficial, failing to consider the real effects of drugs and providing little technical information. The large number of faces appearing before the camera – some of them partially hidden – tends to reduce the impact of their statements, and obscure the reasons and reality behind their individual admissions. The teenage committee uniformly rated the film higher than the adults, citing the authenticity of the drug users' hard-won knowledge. But, summarized a 16-year-old, the point seems to be to show "how busting people brainwashes them to fit into society."*
Rated: *Average.* **Level:** *J, H, C.*

National Health Test, Part III (1967)

11 min., b/w. *Distributor:* McGraw-Hill.

One of a series of nationally televised general-knowledge tests produced by CBS in 1967, this film poses three true-false questions in each of three related categories – mental health, alcohol and narcotics. The answers are provided, amplified upon and documented. The topics include, in the narcotics segment: Do extensive medical cures of addicts usually result in permanent cures? Is the baby of a woman heroin addict likely to be born addicted too? Is injection of a drug the only way to become an addict? (Answers: No, Yes, No.) A national opinion sample is cited in which 84 percent favored treatment of drug addiction as an illness rather than a crime.

Evaluation: *A concise presentation of very basic material, useful for clarifying common misconceptions and initiating further discussion. The information is necessarily limited and sketchy, however, and many felt the format was unimaginative.*
Rated: *Average to good.* **Level:** *H, C, A.*

The Need for Dialogue

See **Drugs the Children Are Choosing.**

Neo Natal Drug Addiction in Newborn Infants (1968)

10 min., color. *Distributor/Producer:* Smith Kline and French Laboratories. *Co-directors:* Dr. Carl Zelson and Dr. Marvin Green, New York University Medical College.

Illustrates and describes the symptoms of neonatal narcotic drug addiction in a new-born infant, including hypertonus, tremors, sneezing and vomiting. Intended as a training film for members of the medical profession.

Evaluation: *Informative for its limited audience.*
Rated: *Good.* **Level:** *PRO (Physicians and nurses).*

A New Method for Hospital Narcotic Control (1965)

12 min., color. *Distributor/Producer:* Wyeth Films.

Using many still photographs, this film describes the innovative approach to drug control instituted at Southeastern General Hospital in Lumberton, North Carolina in 1963. The new system incorporates unit-dose packaging of

medication, simplified inventory records and a universal narcotics check sheet. Under the system, nursing time devoted to narcotic control was reduced from 140 hours to 17 hours per week, and parmacists' time from 10 hours to one hour weekly.

Evaluation: *A promotional film for the individually packaged narcotic products from the pharmaceutical house which sponsored the film. "Propagandizes institution of smaller, more expensive drug units," suggested one reviewer "but does present an appealing case for conserving the precious time of medical professionals."*

Rated: *Fair.* **Level:** *PRO (Hospital Administrators, staff personnel, pharmacists).*

A Nice Kid Like You (1969)

38 min., b/w. *Distributor:* University of California Extension Media Center. *Producer:* Gene Lichtenstein of the Education Research Center, MIT with the guidance of the Committee on the College Student of the Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry (under a grant from the Maurice Falk Medical Fund).

Articulate students at East Coast colleges, both men and women, talk about some of their most important concerns: drugs, sex, political action, their relationships with their peers and with their parents. The documentary camera records uninhibited dormitory bull-sessions, interviews over dining commons coffee, breakfast table conversations in middle-class homes, coffee-klatch discussions among anxious suburban mothers. The focus, however, is on the young, who speak their minds with a candor that is often startling. In general, the use of marijuana is accepted as standard. LSD is a drug from which most now abstain. Dealing in marijuana raises problems: it is profitable but dangerous. On the one hand, business-oriented parents might secretly approve such canny transactions. On the other, even illegal profiting may be a sell-out to the materialism they criticize in America. Sexual relationships have changed greatly because of the birth control pill. Women may now be as free as men – some girls suggesting that they are today even freer and less possessive. The love and concern of these young people for their parents is clear, but they also discuss the conflicts, the attitudes they would like to see in their elders, and how they are attempting to communicate. "It is hoped," note the producers in the opening legend, "that the film will lead to discussion about students, about drugs, and about our society."

Evaluation: *A film which evoked a spectrum of responses. "I cannot determine the purpose of this film," wrote a physician. "This was not representative of college students." However, several other viewers scribbled laconically: "If you haven't yet figured all that out yourself, you're really out of touch." The consensus among both adults and teenagers – unanimous with the latter – was that the film is exceptionally honest, vivid, enlightening for adults and thought-provoking. "Very true and authentic," said an 18-year-old boy. "I could associate with it." The film was awarded a Blue Ribbon at the 1970 American Film Festival.*

Rated: *Very good.* **Level:** *H, C, A, PRO.*

Or Die! (1967)

18 min., b/w. *Distributor/Producer:* Epigoni Films. *Film-maker:* Dan McCarroll.

A brief look at some of the activities of Synanon, a unique social movement run by former drug addicts. This film was made over a period of six months by a film-maker participating in the daily life of Synanon. It shows how intense social interaction and a sense of community can redirect the addict's self-destructive energies toward more positive goals. Included is a comprehensive sequence on the "Synanon Game," a form of group therapy in which members strip away any lies and excuses a member may be using to rationalize his behavior and his use of drugs.

Evaluation: *A terse, documentary-style commercial for the Synanon method. A good deal of information about Synanon is conveyed, but the appetite is also whetted for a great deal more. "Briefness is an asset; it doesn't belabor," noted one committee member. But "before viewing this film," cautioned another, "the viewers must be prepared to understand Synanon and the kind of interaction that occurs there." The film is somewhat choppy and ends abruptly.*

Rated: *Good.* **Level:** *C, A, PRO.*

Pharmacology of Drugs

See **Drugs the Children Are Choosing.**

The Poppy Is Also A Flower (1966)

100 min., color. *Distributor:* Fleetwood Films. *Producer:* United Nations, under supervision of the U.N. *Director:* Terrence Young. *Script:* Jo Eisinger.

A feature film based on a story idea by Ian Fleming. Dramatized the extensive international crime-fighting efforts of the United Nations Narcotics Commission, working with local government agencies. Filmed in Iran, Italy and France, and featuring a large cast of major stars. The plot involves the tracking of a shipment of heroin as it is smuggled around the world. The heroin has been treated to make it radioactive, so it may be traced.

Evaluation: *A thriller – and not particularly thrilling at that – which has minimal educational value and little to say about drug abuse.*

Rated: *Average.* **Level:** *J, H, C, A.*

Potheads in Let's Get Nice

See **Young Film-Makers Talk About Drugs.**

Pot's A Put-On (1969)

10 min., color. *Distributor:* Professional Arts. *Director/Writer:* David W. Parker, Ph.D.

A short, fast-paced sequence of sketches and black-outs designed to puncture the appeal of marijuana through derision. Parodizes the arguments in favor of marijuana use and satirizes those who smoke it. Based on the premise: "Nothing reveals real truth quite as well as comedy."

Evaluation: *A painfully unfunny attempt to be funny. Reviewers felt the concept was intriguing but the execution was, in this case, abominable. The*

humor is heavy-handed, the color garish, the tone shrill. Could conceivably appeal to very young children, but would be hooted out of the room by young people with any sophistication.
Rated: *Poor.* **Level:** *I, J.*

Professor Lettvin Tuned In (1967)

90 min., b/w. *Distributor:* NET Film Service. *Producer:* WGBH-TV.

Disengagement from society, especially through drug use, is assailed by Dr. Jerome Lettvin, Professor of Physiology at MIT, before a television studio audience of high school students. This program is a follow-up to an earlier film debate with Timothy Leary, LSD: LETTVIN VS. LEARY, and allows Lettvin to amplify his argument. It is, in sum, that we live in a dangerous, corrupt, messed-up world. Young people are the ones who will have to change it. To do so, their best judgment must be preserved intact. Drugs blunt and twist judgment, and sap the will to grapple with an admittedly rotten "Establishment." The students pose their own challenging questions, which Lettvin attempts to answer.

Evaluation: *Lettvin, who IS this film, was variously described by committee viewers as wise, compassionate, humane, patient, intelligent, witty, sophistical, temperate, liberal and obnoxious. In spite of this disparity, the film was among the most highly rated of any seen by the committee – many of Lettvin's philosophical opponents, even, rating it as excellent. "Good projection of sympathy and authority," wrote one member. "Argument takes delightful byroads," noted another. "The film," summarized a third, "though not dealing explicitly with drugs, succeeds in presenting in dialogue form the true spiritual problems surrounding the drug problem."*

Rated: *Very good to excellent.* **Level:** *H, C, A. Religious groups.*

Purity Squad (1945)

20 min., b/w. *Distributor:* Films, Inc. *Producer:* MGM.

Dishonest promoters prematurely market a purported "cure" for diabetics. Their "front" of seemingly respectable backers includes a judge. The drug begins to take its toll. The Food and Drug Administration is finally able to step in to stop them, but not before a melodramatic finale including the street murder of the evil lab helper by the gangster-promoters, proving all around that "crime does not pay."

Evaluation: *Has no relation to the reality of the latter half of the 20th Century, if it ever did in the 40's. This slick Hollywood short from the CRIME DOES NOT PAY series of MGM was found to be bad, boring, phoney, lousy, outdated, unbelievable, and "not even good enough for the Late Late Late Show." Don't see it except to suffer or for laughs. Should have been withdrawn when it was first released, though it has somehow survived to remind us that some of our newly produced drug films are just as ridiculous.*

Rated: *Poor.* **Level:** *I, J.*

Rapping (1969)

14 min., b/w. *Distributor:* Frith Films. *Producer:* Nick King and Tom McCarthy.

A candid monologue across a pool table by the Rev. Jesse James, contro-

versial black leader of San Francisco's Mission Rebels – an organization for channeling the energies of slum youths into constructive avenues. The Rev. Mr. James describes his own background: 16 years on drugs, 12 of them "snortin' stuff" – years in prison, mostly for dope but once for a stick-up. Like many black leaders, he received his education there. He became a Black Muslim, but finally threw off the drug habit through an organization known as Teen Challenge. He describes how he relates to ghetto youth, and how they accept him because of this "real" background. He speaks from personal experience of the cunning, drive and intelligence that is required to support a drug habit without a job, by hustling. He suggests that such virtues could be put to good use in the business world if firms would open real opportunities. Similarly, he argues for special techniques to tap the obvious potential in black students – potential which is stifled in rigid white suburban schools. He cradles his infant son in his arms and admits: "I'm tired. Tired of talking and talking all day. We've got to build a better world. This kid is too beautiful to go through all the changes I had to. He's not going to be a 16-year drug addict."

Evaluation: *A moving testimonial by an articulate, intelligent, deeply concerned man who knows the despair that drives young Blacks and Indians and Chicanos to drugs – but also knows what it is to break the habit. "The film," noted one reviewer, "is not a message film, it is a personal testimony film. Candid and low-key and effective for its pure simplicity. A ray of hope in the wasteland."*

Rated: *Very good to excellent.* **Level:** *H, C, A, PRO.*

Research Report: THC – The Chemistry of Marijuana (1968)

20 min., b/w. *Distributor:* NET Film Service. *Producer:* KCET-TV and NET Film Service.

A report on research in progress – a medical experiment to gauge the effects of marijuana on a volunteer human subject. A 23-year-old Stanford University graduate student is administered the equivalent of three marijuana cigarettes. Physiological and psychological tests are given from the initial dosage to the end of the test several hours later. Breathing rate, muscle strength, heartbeat, spatial reasoning and other factors are measured by the supervising physicians. The subject himself describes how he feels at various stages of the experiment. The preliminary, tentative findings of the chief experimenter, Leo E. Hollister, M.D., are that marijuana makes people "happy, intoxicated, sleepy," stimulates appetite and respiration, weakens muscle strength, lowers blood pressure and impairs performance of psychometric tests.

Evaluation: *A straight-forward presentation of research in the working stages, reported with clinical impartiality. Interesting for its disclosure of one experimental method – criticized as less than optimal by several committee scientists – and also interesting for its close-up view of a clean-cut, intelligent young man who is "stoned." Some reviewers felt that the ease and euphoria of the subject would make drug-taking appear attractive, but others suggested that the disparity between his self-image and the obvious intoxication he displays on the screen could be of educational value to young viewers if clearly pointed out. Lack of firm conclusions at the rather abrupt ending*

were felt to be a weakness, but the scientific openness was considered a major strength.

Rated: *Good.* **Level:** *C, A, PRO.*

The Riddle (1966)

20 min., b/w. *Distributor:* Modern Talking Pictures. *Producer:* Helicon Films. *Film-makers:* William Jersey and Barbara Connell. *Presented by:* Job Corps.

A documentary commissioned by the Job Corps of the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity, designed to contrast the idle stupor and empty future of teenage drug takers with the enthusiasm of a black youth who has just been given a job. A folk song on the soundtrack repeatedly challenges: "Who's going to lose and who's going to win?" Candid scenes of teenage drug abuse – glue-sniffing, pot-smoking, heroin preparation – alternate with interviews of drug users of all races. At the end, the youth with the job wanders excitedly among the lathes he will soon be taught to operate. A cough-medicine-and-goofball dosed young man, nearly falling out of his chair, mumbles into the camera that he may "set up a few appointments tomorrow afternoon."

Evaluation; *Authentic, depressing, creative, factual, balanced – these were some of the adjectives used by the committee to describe this film. All praised the use of the folk song lyrics to support and modulate the visual contents. Several felt that a careful introduction would be necessary to prevent misleading inferences – for example, that marijuana smoking necessarily leads to use of harder drugs. Most felt that "ghetto youths" would be the proper audience, since it is they who are depicted, and since suburban teenagers might feel superior. The latter would almost surely scoff at the blue-collar job and restrictive routine over which the young black exults. The film quality is grainy, perhaps due in part to the available-light documentary technique.*

Rated: *Good.* **Level:** *J, H, A, Dropouts.*

Seduction of the Innocent (1961)

10 min., color, b/w. *Distributor/Producer:* Sid Davis Productions. Produced with cooperation of the Santa Monica Police Department and the Santa Monica Unified School District.

A dramatization with sound track narration in the second-person (e.g., "You sat 'toking up.' It didn't give you the kick it used to.") recounting the career of a 20-year-old girl from experimentation with pills to heroin addiction. She begins with various drugs – seconal, tuinal, benzedrine – then progresses to marijuana, finally injects heroin. She steals and becomes a prostitute to pay for drugs, is arrested for street-walking, enters the first painful stages of withdrawal. The future, the narrator concludes, holds little hope. Drug abuse "will lead to a life of hopelessness and degradation, until she escapes in death."

Evaluation: *"The worst movie I've ever seen," wrote a 14-year-old girl. "Exceedingly unrealistic, one-sided and 500-times exaggerated." While this reaction was something of an exaggeration itself, it did reflect the general response of both the adult and teenage committees. Overdone, biased, preachy, misleading, unpleasant to watch, inane, and insidious were some of the words and phrases used to describe this film.*

Rated: *Poor.* **Level:** *H.*

The Seekers (1968)

31 min., color. *Distributor:* Benchmark Films, Inc. *Producer:* Myron Solin of Benchmark Films, Inc. for the New York State Narcotic Addiction Control Commission.

Youthful ex-addicts and former drug users, members of an organization known as Encounter, discuss their experiences. They are filmed in various settings – chatting among themselves, speaking to high school audiences, confronting hippies on park benches. Although there is some acknowledgement of the arguments in favor of drug use, Encounter members have forsworn drugs, and they speak of their decision with deep and often painful conviction. They recount the insecurities and confusions which led them to escape in drugs, or to "cop out" from social responsibility by becoming hippies. They urge others not to repeat their own harrowing mistakes. In a short sequence featuring a physician, the possible genetic injuries attributable to LSD are explained. Near the end of the film there is a moving exchange between a young husband and wife, both former heroin addicts, who admit and then reconcile their doubts about their marriage. Ends with an exhortation to high school students not to be "stupid" and experiment with drugs.

Evaluation: *This film was highly praised by most adult committee members. It was considered only fair to average by the large majority of teenagers. "I think the personal element in the film is what makes it successful," wrote one adult, reflecting that group's impression of believability and emotional impact. "Blah!" adjudged a 17-year-old. In general, the teenagers found the movie boring, biased and too loosely constructed. The adults felt it might be thought-provoking.*
Rated: *Good.* **Level:** *J, H, C, A.*

Speedscene – The Problem of Amphetamine Abuse (1969)

17 min., color. *Distributor:* Bailey/Film Associates. *Producer:* Medi-Cine; Richard S. Scott, M.D.

A fast-paced collage of interviews with youthful "speed freaks," doctors, a sociologist, a housewife hooked on diet pills – all testifying to the grave dangers attendant upon improper use of this drug class. The pattern of regular high-dose injection of methamphetamine – commonly known as a "speed run" – is described. Effects of amphetamine abuse are illustrated by the documentary camera: a wildly thrashing teenager being wrestled into a clinic, a sudden fight in a hallway, a cageful of laboratory mice killing one another after a dose of the drug. The film employs jump cuts, shifts from color to black-and-white, intercutting of titles with beginning and ending scenes to simulate the relentless energy-surges associated with stimulant abuse. The message: amphetamines promote tolerance, entail a risk of compulsive use, induce paranoia and violence in large doses, and can cause liver damage, hepatitis and worse. Speed abusers frequently resort to crime, drop out into a drug-centered underground, suffer from malnutrition, abscesses, skin and gum problems. They often turn to heroin, a depressant, to ease them down from the harrowing runs. In short, the risk, according to one of the users interviewed, is "inevitably death."

Evaluation: *A visually superior film which makes full use of the medium to hammer home its theme: Speed Kills. Although it is thoroughly and uncompromisingly dedicated to this theme, the film is unbiased in the sense that it directs its cautions at the "respectable" suburban adult pill abuser as well as at the more visible long-haired young. And the physicians interviewed even suggest that medical practice could get along quite well without amphetamines altogether.*

Rated: *Very good.* **Level:** *H, C, A.*

Subject: Narcotics(1952)

21 min., color and b/w. *Distributor:* Narcotic Educational Foundation of America. *Producer:* Sanders Brothers Productions in cooperation with the Los Angeles, California County Sheriff's Narcotic Detail. *Technical Advisor:* Lt. Ray Haber.

"Drug addiction," announces a voice as the camera focuses on a writhing withdrawal victim, "is poisoning the bloodstream of our country. If he is lucky, he dies early. Maybe from an overdose, maybe from an infected needle." "Can't we help him?" asks a second voice. "He is long past help," the first declares, "so we will put a stop to it!" To defeat your enemy, warns this training film for police officers, you must first know him. The film discusses briefly the various drug classes and then, in dramatized sketches, shows typical scenes of drug abuse – the preparation and injection of heroin, smuggling, a properly conducted arrest. "If we can't stop the entry of drugs, we've got to crack down on every peddler," suggests the second voice. "Yes," replies the first, "but we are often hindered by weak laws, apathetic judges and juries, and understaffed anti-narcotics forces . . . Without his drug, the addict becomes a desperate, tortured animal. Physically he can be cured, but mentally there is no known cure." "Then there is no hope!" cries the second voice. "The hope lies in prevention," replies the first. "Our laws must be strengthened, enforcement agencies enlarged. The public must be educated to the compelling, habit-forming danger of marijuana, and the deadly addictiveness of the opiates."

Evaluation: *A film whose tenuous grip on the facts is further weakened by an inflammatory and, for professional police officers, wholly inappropriate emotionalism – most of it, indeed, misdirected against the individual addict. The narrative dialogue was critized as "something out of a bad dream of 1930s afternoon radio. Educational brutality against policy." "Their solution is symptomatic relief," wrote one reviewer, "in my opinion the worst kind of symptomatic relief. Does not try to examine the etiology of the problem." Agreed another: "Good social document on the approach that didn't work."*

Rated: *Poor.* **Level:** *PRO.*

Tea, Horse and Crime (1957)

30 min., b/w. *Distributor:* NET Film Service. *Producer:* KQED-TV, Gordon Waldear. *Writer:* Gordon Waldear.

A discussion of the relationship between drugs and crime, by the late Douglas M. Kelley, M.D., professor of criminology at the University of California, Berkeley. In this well-known lecture, Dr. Kelley analyzes the term *narcotic,* assigns it only to depressant drugs (alcohol, barbiturates, opiates), and examines the role of each – as well as the stimulants and marijuana – in pro-

moting or contributing to criminality. He points out that, in general, the crimes committed by drug users are secondary, not primary, effects, and pleads for a return of the handling of drug addicts to the medical rather than the legal-judicial field. Includes a filmed clinical sequence of an addict undergoing withdrawal.

Evaluation: *The lecture format is static and the picture quality of this kinescope is below average. The film seems dated, too. On the other hand, a great deal of accurate, understandable and important information is conveyed in a clear and reasonable tone. There are some logical inconsistencies, but they are probably outweighed by the sincerity of intention manifest in this film.*

Rated: *Good – on basis of content.* **Level:** *H, C, A, PRO (Law enforcement training).*

Teen Squad

See **Young Film-Makers Talk About Drugs.**

Three (1967)

52 min., b/w. *Distributor/Producer:* New York State Narcotics Addiction Control Commission and Benchmark Films. *Producer/Director/Writer:* John A. Sughrue.

A fictional story of three New York City heroin addicts of widely differing backgrounds. Johnny Nolan is a 19-year-old black messenger boy, Tony Flores is a 40-year-old Puerto Rican electronics repairman, and Bart Edwards is a 31-year-old white advertising executive. Their careers are described in flashbacks as they undergo encounter-group therapy at a state rehabilitation facility. When each achieves the necessary breakthrough to awareness of his own weaknesses and reationalizations, they are released from the center and transported to a new, experimental neighborhood halfway house in the city. There they will gradually ease back into the normal world and its pressures. But an angry mob of picketers is gathered to protest the presence of these ex-addicts in their neighborhood, and the mob advances on the terror-stricken occupants of the prison bus. The film closes abruptly with a plea for community support, cooperation and understanding in the establishment of narcotic addiction control programs.

Evaluation: *An earnest effort in a good cause, but a film characterized by overacting, a misdirected attempt to be arty – through the sudden use, at the end, of distortive camera lenses – and a badly paced plot. The encounter-group scenes suffer greatly by comparison with the real thing, available in a number of other films. The topic was considered important and the attitude to the addicts sympathetic, but the film's overall impact seemed questionable.*

Rated: *Average.* **Level:** *A.*

Tomorrow May Be Dying (1959)

23 min., b/w. *Distributor:* University of Southern California.

The story of two girls – Jeanne, a pretty brunette, seduced, addicted, degraded, impregnated and abandoned by her heroin-pushing boyfriend – and Sandy – blonde, fun-loving, on the verge of succumbing to the blandishments of a devil-may-care suitor who offers her liquor and pills and thrills. Jeanne, in the throes of withdrawal and childbirth, calls Sandy for help. Sandy arrives at Jeanne's apartment and, in response to her pleas, agrees to arrange for an

illicit delivery there. The baby is born addicted like its mother. The shady physician recommends immediate hospitalization for the baby. Jeanne wrestles with her conscience, finally decides to turn herself in. Sandy watches as her friend is led away by the police – to suffer withdrawal alone in a cell.

Evaluation: *A confused and confusing soap-opera, poorly produced by college graduate students. The film is dated, the message is vague, the plot wanders drunkenly and the effect is laughable. "A Peyton Place hand-wringer," wrote one committee member in dismissal.*
Rated: *Poor.* **Level:** *J, H, C.*

Tomorrow Never Comes

See **Young Film-Makers Talk About Drugs.**

Tranquilizers (1964)

29 min., b/w. *Distributor:* University of Southern California. *Producers:* USC/KNXT.

A kinescope lecture from a University of Southern California *Apothecary* course series for educational television. Lecturer Dr. Edward S. Brady describes the history, composition, physical and psychotropic effects of tranquilizing agents, including opium, bromides, alcohol and barbiturates. A tranquilizer, it is noted, is an agent which acts to produce a state of mental calm without depressing the thought process. The effect of tranquilizing drugs in reducing the number of admissions to mental hospitals is discussed, but Dr. Brady warns that they do not solve the underlying causes of mental illness and recommends against use of tranquilizers to deal with the stresses of everyday living. Problems of dependence, side effects and reinforcement of depressive action when used in combination with other drugs are topics included in the discussion.

Evaluation: *An informative, competent scientific lecture, but a film of very limited usefulness except with professional or pre-professional groups. Again the format is static except for some still graphics, and the kinescope quality is below average.*
Rated: *Fair to average.* **Level:** *C, A, PRO.*

The Trip Back: The Florrie Fisher Story (1968)

28 min., color. *Distributor:* Sterling Educational Films. *Producer:* Avon Productions, presented as a public service by New York Daily News.

Florrie Fisher, a slender, slightly haggard but attractive middle-aged New Yorker who admits to 23 years of heroin addiction (17 of them behind prison bars) recounts her experiences to an audience of high school students. Now a member of Synanon, which she credits with saving her life, Miss Fisher presents a highly personal, emotional appeal to teenagers to avoid the tragedies which befell her because of drugs. She cautions against the use of marijuana, admitting that experimenters do not always graduate to heroin ("I have six friends who didn't. That's because they were electrocuted for committing crimes of passion while under the influence of marijuana!"), tells of a girl who leaped from a hospital window while recovering

from a bad LSD trip, emphasizes that a life of addiction and crime "CAN happen to you," and urges them to turn in their drug-taking friends for their own good. Help and identification are the only way an addict can rehabilitate himself, she says. Jails and hospitals are not the answer.

Evaluation: *Although Miss Fisher is honest, articulate and painfully sincere, most adult committee members felt that her appeal would have little real or lasting impact on the young. "The effect of exposes wears off when the emotion induced by them dissipates," wrote one. While the teenagers, the target audience, gave the film a somewhat higher evaluation, all mentioned that it was "biased" – a description Miss Fisher would hardly deny. Her emphases are understandable but very selective and personal – an attempt not so much at drug education as at attitude-shaping by horrible example.* **Rated:** *Fair to average.* **Level:** *J, H.*

A Trip to Where (1968)

50 min., color. *Distributor:* National AV Center. *Producer:* Petersen Company for internal use in the U.S. Navy. *Script:* Harvey R. Langee, M.D.

A dramatization of the impact of drug use on the lives and careers of three youthful sailors, produced for U.S. Navy audiences. Information about methedrine, barbiturates and alcohol is woven into a plot centering on the abuse of marijuana and LSD – with emphasis on the problem of flashbacks. As a result of their naive experimentation, one of the sailors becomes psychotic, one receives a dishonorable discharge and a prison sentence, and one loses his FAA air controller's license and his opportunity to re-enlist. The effectiveness of the Navy is based on the individual reliability and performance of each man, the film notes, and anyone who jeopardizes his mental capabilities can weaken the defense of the country.

Evaluation: *A glossy, highly professional production, but one which suffers from overdramatization, an effort to compress too much information into a fictional format, and a very limited appeal. The Navy orientation invalidates the message for any audience with even vaguely antimilitary sentiments. The flashback episode was felt to be exaggerated, and the military punishments seemed, to several viewers, to be out of proportion to the crimes – an inducement to avoid medical help rather than seeking it out.* **Rated;** *Average to good.* **Level:** *H, C, A, PRO (Navy).*

What Can We Do?
What Some Communities Are Doing

See **Drugs the Children Are Choosing.**

Who Cops Out? 1969

11 min., color. *Distributor:* International Film Bureau, Inc. *Sponsor:* Mental Health Authorities of States of California, South Carolina, Maryland.

The Audience is invited to consider students' motivations for continuing or stopping education in the face of obstacles. Different high school students act out situations which are designed to precipitate teenage audience reaction: e.g., pregnant high schooler who doesn't really like the guy, football

star who has trouble academically, a drop out working as a gas station attendant, a student who does not feel cramped by "the system," a girl who wanted to be free but wasn't prepared for boredom and has turned to the drug culture.

Evaluation: *This film deals only tangentially with the drug problem (drug use is merely one of the five examples). What the film attempts is a teenage perspective on educational motivation. It gives recognition to the problems of teen life; it is sympathetic and only slightly patronizing. It asks the students to consider positive alternatives before moving in a direction which will blight their future fulfillment. The short sequence on the drug user illustrates that the same boredom found at school can also exist in the real world and that turning onto drugs is no adequate solution.*
Rating: *Good.* **Level:** *J, H.*

Why Must the Flowers Die? (1968)

11 min., color. *Distributor:* Independent Film Producers Company. A Cine-Pic Hawaii Production. *Producer/Director:* George Tahara.

Attractive young Hawaiian boys act out a tragedy caused by glue-sniffing and goofballs. It begins with the protagonist's voice, "My name is . . . I died about four hours ago from an overdose of goofballs." It then shows what developments led to his death; his admiration for an older friend; his attraction to glue and depressants, and the episodes that lead to his death – all through his own point-of-view.

Evaluation: *The adults thought the film used the "shock treatment" or scare approach, was melodramatic and even somewhat confusing. They found, curiously, the theme and format good, but the heavily stylized manner and picturesque cinematography worked at odds with the subject matter. They were disturbed by its use of vernacular; a police lieutenant found it "rather crude and unnecessarily filled with profanities." The adults rated it "poor" to "fair." The 17 students, 14 to 18 years old, who saw it rated it from "fair" to "excellent" with an average of "good" to "very good." They, on the whole, found it communicating directly with them and not an attempt to preach or lecture. They found it "very realistic, truthful, down to earth, has a real sense of scene, language, people." One 18-year-old girl thought it "would be very authentic to younger children," but felt the creative qualities, "weren't realistic or authentic," echoing others opinions that its creative qualities were "bad," though one thought them "imaginative."*
Rated: *Good.* **Level:** *P, I, J.*

World of the Weed (1968)

21 min., b/w. *Distributor:* NET Film Service. *Producer:* KCET-TV for NET. *Producer:* David Guner. *Director:* Richard S. Scott, M.D. *Writer:* Richard Tuber.

A documented history of Cannabis sativa (marijuana), from its first appearance in China in 2737 B.C. to its use in the United States today. This objective study begins with an ancient Chinese legend about the mystical

powers of Cannabis, then traces the spread of the plant to India, the Middle East and Europe. It was first grown commercially in the U.S. in 1611 at Jamestown, and was even raised by George Washington and used for cloth and rope making. Through the effective use of photographs and drawings, the film traces the evolution of the plant in the United States, showing how its use as a drug has led to confusion and controversy. There is a review of medical studies relating to marijuana – including the British Indian Hemp Drugs Commission and the LaGuardia Report – legislation concerning the plant, and the United Nations effort to curtail its nonscientific use throughout the world.

Evaluation: *Fascinating as history, useful as a background to the value judgments which are, for the most part, carefully skirted here. There is at least one questionable item – identification of soma with marijuana. Overall, however, the film is informative, intelligent and visually attractive. "Brings into focus the fact that decisions are frequently made without the necessary information," noted one reviewer. The film is an attempt to supply some of that missing information.*

Rated: *Very good to excellent.* **Level:** *H, C, A.*

You Can't Grow a Green Plant in a Closet (1970)

52 min., color and b/w. *Distributor:* ZiP Film Distributing Company. Produced with the cooperation of the University of California Medical Center, Medical Center Psycho-pharmacology Study Group and the Haight-Ashbury Medical Clinic, San Francisco.

Excerpts from the 1968 National Symposium on Marijuana, in which the medical scientific, social, psychological, moral, legal and law enforcement aspects of the marijuana controversy are explored by experts. Historical and contemporary approaches to the drug are examined, and many widespread fallacies now interwoven into the mythology and demonology of marijuana are disentangled. The opinions expressed are overwhelmingly counter to prevailing official attitudes. The connection between marijuana and heroin use is flatly disputed, the classification of the drug as a narcotic is assailed (it is rather, says one expert, "Sedative-hypnotic"), the widespread use of the drug around the world is reported and placed – in its American context – squarely within the best traditions of our "drug culture." Participants include Joel Fort, M.D., David Smith, M.D., Price Cobbs, M.D., Roger Smith, Ph.D., Lewis Yablonsky, Ph.D., James Carey, M.D., and Eugene Schoenfeld, M.D. A panel of college students also add their views.

Evaluation: *An unusually authoritative position paper in defense of marijuana – or at least in opposition to current legal and propagandistic efforts directed against its use. Actually, the film is designed to clear the air by dispassionate – and sometimes passionate – analysis of available scientific, psychological and sociological knowledge. The film is biased, but clearly documents the grounds for its bias. "Well-filmed segments of speeches and demonstrations," summarized one committee reviewer. "Interesting, but still basically a talking-head show." The pun was probably unintended.*

Rated: *Very good to excellent.* **Level:** *H, C, A.*

Young Filmmakers Talk About Drugs (The End; Life in New York; The Potheads in Let's Get Nice; Teen Squad; Tomorrow Never Comes) (1969)

For time lengths – see description. *Distributor:* Youth Film Distribution Center.

Each of these short films was produced by a teenage resident of a New York slum neighborhood as part of a city-wide film club project. **The End** is a nine-minute b/w surrealistic vision of America, drug-ridden and at war through the ironic eyes of Alfonso Sanches, Jr., 18; **Life in New York** is an angry six-minute statement in color by Alfonso Pagan-Cruz, 17, newly arrived from Puerto Rico, and Luis Vale, 18; **The Potheads in Let's Get Nice** is Sanchez' five-minute black-and-white interpretation of a marijuana "high"; **Teen Squad,** by Rapael Colon, 16, is an eight-minute color drama of teenagers playing undercover Narcotics Squad agents; and **Tomorrow Never Comes,** by Edgar Sanchez, 16, dramatizes in eight minutes of black-and-white film the escape to drugs and ultimate self-destruction of a boy whose girl friend has been killed in a street accident.

Evaluation: *At times sophisticated, at times naive, at times showing an astonishing dexterity in use of the medium, at other times predictably amateurish, this group of unusual films never lacks for interest. The films, individually or together, provide a unique insight into the concerns of the urban minority young – the context in which they turn to drugs. Although certainly a change of pace in any drug education program, discussions to plumb the motives and meanings behind these films could prove unusually fruitful – an indirect entry into the subject of drug use and its relationship to social conditions.*

Rated: *Very good, very good, good, good and average respectively (in order listed above).* **Level:** *J, H, C, A, PRO.*

Your Amazing Mind (1969)

15 min., color. *Distributor/Producer:* Alfred Higgins Productions.

Man's amazing mind – the world's single greatest resource – has been responsible for the invention of the automobile, the airplane, the skyscraper, life-saving medical advances, synthetics, rockets. Drugs, however, can distort the mind. This film then catalogues some of the drugs people abuse to distort their minds, briefly explaining the effects of each. The discussion includes amphetamines, barbiturates, glue and aerosols, marijuana, LSD. The time-space distortion caused by marijuana is illustrated by a bloody automobile accident. Dr. J. Thomas Ungerleider explains that LSD changes the structure of certain bodily cells, probably permanently, thus carrying a risk for users' children and grandchildren. A young girl is shown "freaking out," and a boy leaps to his death from a high balcony. The strict control of dangerous narcotics is illustrated by an arrest scene. Many drug users, the film declares, go on to stronger drugs, seeking bigger kicks. The film ends with short statements by children who testify that they do not believe in experimentation with drugs.

Evaluation: *Technically smooth, this film would probably hold the interest*

of the intermediate and lower junior high school level audiences for whom it is intended. Adult viewers, however, expressed many serious reservations about its effectiveness. The narration is patronizing and the emphasis is on the traditional "scare" techniques: death, insanity, arrest, etc. Several reviewers criticized the omission of alcohol from the discussion. Many felt that the obvious one-sidedness of the film would alienate even those children opposed to drug use. "Interestingly," added one committee member, "the handling of the medium was psychedelic, so the film makes the trip experience attractive." Another pointed out that the mental achievements singled out for praise are precisely the "chrome/plastic" goods young drug apologists reject. It was noted that all children speaking at the end are white, and all seem very callow.
Rated: *Average.* **Level:** *I, J.*

RATINGS

Excellent
- Grooving
- Law: How Effective Is It?

Very Good to Excellent
- Beyond LSD: A Film for Concerned Adults and Teenagers
- Drugs in the Tenderloin
- Drugs the Children Are Choosing – The Allure of Drugs
- Marathon: The Story of Young Drug Users
- Marijuana (CBS Reports)
- Professor Lettvin Tuned In
- Rapping
- World of the Weed
- You Can't Grow a Green Plant in a Closet

Very Good
- The Addicted
- The Current Scene
- David
- A Day in the Death of Donnie B.
- Drug Abuse – One Town's Answer
- Drugs and the Nervous System
- Drugs the Children Are Choosing – Drugs in Our Culture
- Drugs the Children Are Choosing – The Pharmacology of Drugs
- Drugs the Children Are Choosing – What Some Communities Are Doing
- Escape to Nowhere
- Flowers of Darkness
- From Pot to Psychedelics
- LSD-25
- A Nice Kid Like You
- Speedscene – The Problem of Amphetamine Abuse
- Young Film-Makers Talk About Drugs: The End
- Young Film-Makers Talk About Drugs: Life in New York

Good to Very Good
- Bridge from Noplace
- The Circle: An Approach to Drug Addiction
- Dr. Gardner Murphy: Part II
- Drug Abuse: A Call to Action
- Drugs the Children Are Choosing – Drugs and the Very Young

Hooked
LSD: Lettvin vs. Leary
LSD: The Spring Grove Experiment
The Maze – Haight Ashbury
The Mind Benders – LSD and the Hallucinogens
A Movable Scene

Good

Drug Abues: Bennies and Goofballs
Drug Decision
Drugs: Facts Everyone Needs to Know
Drugs the Children Are Choosing – The Need for Dialogue
Drugs the Children Are Choosing – What Can We Do?
Face of An addict
False Friends
The Farthest Frontier
The Hippie Temptation
House on the Beach
LSD: The Other Side of Reality
Neo Natal Drug Addiction in Newborn Infants
Or Die!
Research Report: THC – The Chemistry of Marijuana
The Riddle
The Seekers
Tea, Horse and Crime
Who Cops Out?
Why Must the Flowers Die?
Young Film-Makers Talk About Drugs: The Potheads in Let's Get Nice
Young Film-Makers Talk About Drugs: Teen Squad

Average to Good

National Health Test, Part III
A Trip to Where?

Average

The Chemistry of Behavior
Danger: LSD
Drug Addiction
Fight or Flight?
Hide and Seek
Junky
Keep Off the Grass
LSD – Insight or Insanity?
LSD: The Trip to Where?
The Losers
Marijuana
Mindscape
Narcotics and Kids
Narcotics: The Inside Story
Narcotics: Pit of Despair
Narcotics – Why Not?
The Poppy Is Also a Flower
Three
Young Film-Makers Talk About Drugs: Tomorrow Never comes
Your Amazing Mind

Fair to Average

Dangerous Drugs
Tranquilizers
The Trip Back

Fair

Drug Safety
Hallucinogens
LSD
Narcotics Trade
New Method for Hospital Narcotic Control

Fair to Poor

Drug Abuse: The Chemical Tomb
Drugs and Conquest
The Mad Chemist

Poor

From Runaway to Hippie
LSD: Trip or Trap!
Narcosis
Narcotics: A Challenge to Youth/Teachers
Narcotics: The Decision
Pot's a Put-On
Purity Squad
Seduction of the Innocent
Subject: Narcotics
Tomorrow May Be Dying

6218

INDEX

This INDEX is designed to be of assistance to those seeking the best drug films for their own special use. Categories have been evoloved based upon general drug classifications, and the major emphasis or outstanding values of certain films. The INDEX does not group the films according to audience orientation; you will find grade or age levels and special audiences listed after the EVALUATION of each film. We recommend a full reading of the entire publication, for even a reading familiarity will provide a greater depth of knowledge about the entire field of drug films. Moreover, the descriptions and evaluations in the handbook, taken together, offer a great deal of information about the subject of drugs – both popular mythology as well as factual knowledge. Used imaginatively, the INDEX may suggest how to utilize the films in special new ways.

INDEX CATEGORIES

Community Action / Support
Definition of Drugs / Pharmacology
Depressants / Barbiturates / Sedatives
Drug Culture
Drug Education Courses / Plans / Strategies
Drug User's Help Centers / Rehabilitation
Drugs – Overviews and Miscellanea
Encounter Groups / T Sessions / The Game
Ghetto Centered Drug Films
Glue / Gas / Aerosol Sniffing
Hallucinogens / Psychoactive Drugs / LSD / STP, etc.
Heroin / Opium / Morphine
History of Drugs
Legal Drug Use
Marijuana / Cannabis / THC
Middle / Upper Class Centered Drug Films
Research Reports
Stimulants / Amphetamines / Speed
Youth Speaks Out On Drugs

Series Listing

CLASSIFIED INDEX

Community Action / Support
Drug Abuse: A Call to Action
Drug Abuse: One Town's Answer
Drugs: The Children Are Choosing – What Can We Do?
Drugs: The Children Are Choosing – What Some Communities Are Doing
Three
(See also: Encounter Groups)

Definition of Drugs / Pharmacology
Dangerous Drugs
Drugs and the Nervous System
Drugs: The Children Are Choosing – The Pharmacology of Drugs
Drugs: Facts Everyone Needs to Know
Drug Safety
Hallucinogens
Narcotics: The Inside Story
Tea, Horse and Crime
You Can't Grow a Green Plant in a Closet
Your Amazing Mind
(See also: Depressants. . , Heroin. . , Hallucinogens. . , Stimulants. . , individual drugs)

Depressants/Barbiturates/Sedatives
Drug Abuse: Bennies and Goofballs

Drugs and the Nervous System
The Mad Chemist
Narcotics: The Inside Story
Tranquilizers
(See also: Definition. . , Drugs — Overviews. Note: Many of the other films also included depressants.)

Drug Culture
Beyond LSD
Bridge from Noplace
Danger: LSD
Dr. Gardner Murphy
Drug Abuse: Bennies and Goofballs
Drug Abuse: The Chemical Tomb
Drug Abuse: One Town's Answer
Drugs: The Children Are Choosing — Drugs and the Very Young
Drugs: The Children Are Choosing — Drugs in Our Culture
Drugs in the Tenderloin
Face of an Addict
From Pot to Psychedelics
From Runaway to Hippie
The Hippie Temptation
Junky
The Law: How Effective Is It?
LSD: Insight or Insanity?
LSD: Lettvin vs. Leary
The Losers
The Mad Chemist
The Maze: Haight-Ashbury
The Mind Benders
A Movable Scene
A Nice Kid Like You
Professor Lettvin Tuned In
Rapping
Seduction of the Innocent
Speedscene: Problem of Amphetamine Abuse
A Trip to Where?
Who Cops Out?
You Can't Grow a Green Plant in a Closet
Young Film-Makers Talk About Drugs
(See also: Ghetto Centered. . , Middle / Upper Class. .)

Drug Education Courses / Plans / Strategies
Apothecary Series *(See Series Listing, end of Index)*
The Circle
David
Drug Abuse: A Call to Action
Drug Abuse: One Town's Answer
Drugs: The Children Are Choosing Series *(See Series Listing, end of Index)*
Drugs: Facts Everyone Needs to Know
Farthest Frontier
Hooked
House on the Beach
The Mad Chemist
Marathon
Narcotics: A Challenge to Youth / Teachers
Narcotics and Kids
National Health Test
Neo Natal Drug Addiction in Newborn Infants
Or Die!
The Riddle
The Seekers
Subject: Narcotics

Drug User's Help Centers / Rehabilitation
The Circle
David
Drug Abuse: A Call to Action
Drug Abuse: One Town's Answer
Face of an Addict
False Friends
Fight or Flight
The Hippie Temptation
Hooked
House on the Beach
Junky
LSD: The Spring Grove Experiment
Or Die!

Marathon
Narcotics: Why Not?
Rapping
The Seekers
Three
The Trip Back

Drugs – Overviews and Miscellanea
Dangerous Drugs
Distant Drummer
Dr. Gardner Murphy
Drug Safety
Drugs and the Nervous System
Drugs: The Children Are Choosing – Drugs in Our Culture
Drugs: Facts Everyone Needs to Know
Fight or Flight
From Pot to Psychedelics
Junky
The Losers
The Mind Benders
Narcotics: A Challenge to Youth/ Teachers
Narcotics: The Decision
Narcotics: The Inside Story
National Health Test
The Poppy Is Also a Flower
Professor Lettvin Tuned In
Seduction of the Innocent
Your Amazing Mind

Encounter Groups / T Sessions / The Game
The Circle
David
House on the Beach
Junky
Marathon
Or Die!
The Seekers
Three
(See also: Drug User's. . .)

Ghetto Centered Drug Films
The Addicted
A Day in the Death of Donnie B
Drugs in the Tenderloin
Hooked
Rapping

The Riddle
Young Film-Makers Talk About Drugs

Glue / Gas / Aerosol Sniffing
Drugs: The Children Are Choosing – The Pharmacology of Drugs
From Runaway to Hippie
The Losers
The Mad Chemist
Why Must the Flowers Die?
Your Amazing Mind

Hallucinogens / Psychoactive Drugs / LSD / STP, etc.
Beyond LSD
The Chemistry of Behavior
Danger: LSD
Drugs: The Children Are Choosing Series
Farthest Frontier
From Pot to Psychedelics
From Runaway to Hippie
Hallucinogens
The Hippie Temptation
The Law: How Effective Is It?
LSD
LSD: Insight or Insanity?
LSD: Lettvin vs. Leary
LSD: The Other Side of Reality
LSD: The Spring Grove Experiment
LSD: Trip or Trap!
LSD: Trip to Where?
LSD–25
The Mad Chemist
The Maze: Haight-Ashbury
The Mind Benders
Mindscape
A Nice Kid Like You
Professor Lettvin Tuned In
The Seekers
A Trip to Where?
Your Amazing Mind
(See also: Heroin. . , Marijuana. . , Research Reports, and individual types of drugs)

Heroin / Opium / Morphine
The Addicted

A Day in the Death of Donnie B
David
Drug Addiction
Drugs in the Tenderloin
Escape to Nowhere
False Friends
Flowers of Darkness
Hide and Seek
Hooked
Junky
The Losers
Narcosis
Narcotics: The Decision
Narcotics: Pit of Despair
Narcotics Trade
Narcotics: Why Not?
Neo Natal Drug Addiction in Newborn Infants
The Poppy Is Also a Flower
Rapping
The Seekers
Subject: Narcotics
Tea, Horse and Crime
Three
The Trip Back
Tomorrow May Be Dying
Tranquilizers
You Can't Grow a Green Plant in a Closet
(See also: Research Reports)

History of Drugs
Drugs and Conquest
Drugs: The Children Are Choosing – The Allure of Drugs
Farthest Frontier
Flowers of Darkness
From Pot to Psychedelics
Narcotics Trade
World of the Weed

Legal Drug Use
Drug Safety
Drugs: The Children Are Choosing – The Allure of Drugs
Drugs: The Children Are Choosing – Drugs and the Very Young
Drugs: The Children Are Choosing – Drugs in Our Culture
Drugs and Conquest
Farthest Frontier
LSD: The Spring Grove Experiment
Marijuana (CBS Reports)
The Mind Benders
New Method for Hospital Narcotic Control
Purity Squad
Tranquilizers
World of the Weed
You Can't Grow a Green Plant in a Closet

Marijuana / Cannabis / THC
The Current Scene
Drugs: The Children Are Choosing – The Allure of Drugs
From Pot to Psychedelics
From Runaway to Hippie
Keep Off the Grass
The Law: How Effective Is It?
Marijuana
Marijuana (CBS Reports)
A Nice Kid Like You
Pot's a Put On
Research Report – THC: The Chemistry of Marijuana
Tea, Horse and Crime
A Trip to Where?
World of the Weed
You Can't Grow a Green Plant in a Closet

Middle / Upper Class Centered Drug Films
Note: The great majority of drug films fall in this category. The following film give particular stress to these strata of society.
Bridge from Noplace
David
Drug Abuse: A Call to Action
Drug Abuse: One Town's Answer
Drugs: The Children Are Choosing Series
Face of an Addict

From Pot to Psychedelics
Grooving
Hide and Seek
The Hippie Temptation
Keep Off the Grass
The Law: How Effective Is It?
Marijuana
Marijuana (CBS Reports)
A Movable Scene
Narcotics: Pit of Despair
A Nice Kid Like You
Speedscene: Problem of Amphetamine Abuse
Your Amazing Mind

Research Reports

The Chemistry of Behavior
Farthest Frontier
Research Report: THC – The Chemistry of Marijuana
LSD: The Other Side of Reality
LSD: The Spring Grove Experiment
The Mind Benders
Neo Natal Drug Addiction in Newborn Infants
New Method for Hospital Narcotic Control

Please NOTE: The following three films were discovered for the Committee, screened and evaluated by it, but found to be of such specialized historical interest that we have chosen to list them separately with their source:

Effects of Morphine on Learned Adaptive Behavior and Experimental Neuroses in Cats. (1942 – Authors: J. H. Masserman and W. Wikler. Silent, 17 mins. B/W.)

Effects of Various Drugs (alcohol, metrazol, morphine, sodium amytal) on the Emotional Mimetic Reactions of the Hypothalamus and Cerebral Cortex of the Cat. (1940 – Author: J. H. Masserman. Silent, 20 mins. B/W.)

Sexual Behavior in Normal, Socially Isolated and LSD-25 Injected Guinea Pigs. (1959 – Authors: A. A. Gerall and H. W. Dunning. Silent, 17 mins. B/W.)

All three films are available from the PSYCHOLOGICAL CINEMA REGISTER, AUDIO VISUAL SERVICES, THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY, UNIVERSITY PARK, PA. 16802.

Stimulants / Amphetamines / Speed

Drug Abuse: Bennies and Goofballs
Drugs in the Tenderloin
Narcotics: The Inside Story
Speedscene: Problem of Amphetamine Abuse

(See also: Definition. . , Drugs – Overviews. NOTE: Many of the other films included stimulants.)

Youth Speaks Out On Drugs

Drug Abuse: One Town's Answer
Drugs: The Children Are Choosing – Drugs and the Very Young
Drugs: The Children Are Choosing – The Need for Dialogue
Drugs in the Tenderloin
Grooving
Hooked
Marathon
The Mind Benders
Mindscape
Narcotics and Kids
Narcotics: Why Not?
A Nice Kid Like You
Or Die!
The Seekers
Speedscene: Problem of Amphetamine Abuse
Tomorrow May Be Dying
Who Cops Out?
Young Film-Makers Talk About Drugs

SERIES LISTING

NOTE: Some films are made as elements of a series and are designed to be used in sequence. However, single films selected from a series may be useful alone.

Apothecary Series

(An ETV Pharmacology course produced by the University of Southern California.) Individual lectures selected for evaluation by the Committee were:

Dangerous Drugs
Drug Safety
Drugs and Conquest
Hallucinogens
Tranquilizers

The Distant Drummer Series

(Is both the title of a single film and a series title.) These are:

Bridge from Noplace
Flowers of Darkness
A Movable Scene
*The Distant Drummer

**The last film is a combination of the first three, shortened by 22 minutes for a total running time of 45 minutes. (An even shorter – half-hour – version may appear soon.)*

Drugs: The Children Are Choosing Series

(A 7-film series especially recommended for teacher and parent education. They are all listed under the series title in combination with a sub-title denoting the content. All will be found together in the description-evaluation section under Drugs: The Children Are Choosing.) They are:

Drugs: The Children Are Choosing – Drugs in Our Culture
Drugs: The Children Are Choosing – The Allure of Drugs
Drugs: The Children Are Choosing – The Pharmacology of Drugs
Drugs: The Children Are Choosing – Drugs and the Very Young
Drugs: The Children Are Choosing – The Need for Dialogue
Drugs: The Children Are Choosing – What Some Communities Are Doing
Drugs: The Children Are Choosing – What Can We Do?

ADDITIONAL DRUG FILMS (NOT VIEWED BY THE COMMITTEE)

Are Drugs the Answer (1970)
National Audiovisual Center

The Business of Heroin
CBS–TV

Chasing the Dragon
McGraw-Hill

Dangerous Drugs
Narcotic Education Foundation of America

Darkness, Darkness
Nolan, Wilton & Wooten, Inc.

The Distant Drummer
National Audiovisual Center

Dope
Leacock/Pennebaker

Drug Abuse Everybody's Hangup
The U.S. Bureau of Narcotics & Dangerous Drugs

Here's Help (1970)
National Audiovisual Center

I'll Be Seeing You (1970)
AIMS Instructional Media Services

Inhale, Exhale: The New Terror
Stanley Brady Productions

Inner Trip
RMI Film Productions

Kick
Jymie Films

The Little Pusher
Universal Education and Visual Arts

Marijuana: The Great Escape (1970)
Bailey/Film Associates

Marijuana Lecture
Creative Film Society

The Maze: Etched in Acid (1967)
KPIX-TV

Narcotics and Kids
Newenhouse/Novo

People Next Door
Bailey/Film Associates

Post Mortem (1967)
Cine Associates

The Sandalmaker
Paulist Productions

Scag
Encyclopaedia Britannica Films

Skezag
Cinnamon Productions, Inc.

Someone Is Watching (1958)
New York State Department of Health

Stop Before You Try Drugs!
Jayark Corporation

The Trip
Newenhouse/Novo

Tripping
Film Fair

Trip to Nowhere (1970)
NBC

Way Out (35 mm only)
Premiere Presentations

Youth Drug Scene
Family Films

Youth Drug Ward (1970)
KQED-TV

ADDITIONAL DRUG FILMS (CURRENTLY UNAVAILABLE)

The Addict Alone (1967)
Rediffusion Television

Agents of Drug Abuse

Alcohol and Drugs (1959)
NET

Assassin of Youth (1957)

The Drug Addict (1948)
Youth Conservation Crusade

Drug Addiction (1966)
Xerox

Drug Addiction – A Medical Hazard (1956)
Maryland University

H-Story of a Teenage Drug Addict (1951)
McGraw-Hill

H.A.V.E.N. in Hell (1965)

Hellow America (1968)

Marijuana (1969)
NET

Monkey on the Back (1955)
NFBC

Morphine Physical Dependence in the Monkey (1963)
University of Michigan

Narcotics (1953)

Narcotic Addiction Among Teenagers (1955)
NET

Narcotic Addiction: Its Medical Management (1963)
N.Y. Academy of Medicine

Narcotic Traffic Among Teenagers (1956)
NET

Payoff in Pain (1948)
NFBC

Scent of Danger (1962)

Terrible Truth (1951)

Wasteage of Human Resources (1947)
EBEC

World of Dreams (1967)

DISTRIBUTOR DIRECTORY

AIMS Instructional Media Services
PO Box 1010
Hollywood, CA 90028

Association Films, Inc.
600 Grand Avenue
Ridgefield, NJ 07657

Association Instructional Materials
600 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10022

Bailey-Film Associates
11559 Santa Monica Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90025

Benchmark Films
516 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10036

Stanley Brady Productions
6670 Lindenhurst Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90048

CBS-TV
485 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10022

California Peace Officers' Assn.
802 Forum Building
Sacramento, CA 95814

Carousel Films
1501 Broadway
New York, NY 10036

Center for Mass Communication
Columbia University Press
440 West 110th Street
New York, NY 10025

Churchill Films
662 North Robertson Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90069

Cine Associates
Box 3618
Washington, D.C. 20007

Cinnamon Productions, Inc.
508 Broadway
New York, NY 10012

Creative Film Society
14558 Valerio Street
Van Nuys, CA 91405

Sid Davis Productions
2429 Ocean Park Blvd.
Santa Monica, CA 90405

Encyclopaedia Britannica Films
425 North Michigan Avenue
Chicago, IL 60611

Epigoni Films
Motion Picture Distribution
Box 25291
Los Angeles, CA 90025

Family Films
5823 Santa Monica Blvd.
Hollywood, CA 90038

Film Distributors International
2223 South Olive Street
Los Angeles, CA 90007

Film Fair
Universal City, CA 91608

Films, Inc.
1144 Wilmette Avenue
Wilmette, IL 60091

Fiorelli Films
Research Drive
Stamford, CT 06906

Fleetwood Films, Inc.
34 MacQuesten Parkway South
Mount Vernon, NY 10550

Frith Films
PO Box 424
Carmel Valley, CA 93924

Health Education Materials
PO Box 7283
Albany, NY 12224

Alfred Higgins Productions
9100 Sunset Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90069

Independent Film Producers Co.
PO Box 501
Pasadena, CA 91102

International Film Bureau
332 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, IL 60604

J & F Productions
Suite 700
1401 Walnut Street
Philadelphia, PA 19102

Jayark Corp.
Educational Programs Division
10 East 49th Street
New York, NY 10017

Jymie Films
1256 Bedford Avenue
Brooklyn, NY 11216

KPIX-TV
2655 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94109

KQED Television
525 4th Street
San Francisco, CA 94107

KRON-TV
1001 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94119

Leacock/Pennebaker
56 West 45th Street
New York, NY 10036

McGraw-Hill Text-Films
Text-Film Division
McGraw-Hill Book Co.
Hightstown, NJ 08520

Modern Talking Picture Service
3 East 54th Street
New York, NY 10022

Narcotic Educational
Foundation of America
Box 1934
Los Angeles, CA 90028

NBC Educational Enterprises
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, NY 10020

National Audiovisual Center
National Archives
& Records Service (GSA)
Washington, D.C. 20409

NET Film Service
Indiana University
Audio Visual Center
Bloomington, IN 47401

Newenhouse/Novo
1825 Willow Road
Northfield, IL 60093

Nolan, Wilton & Wooten, Inc.
374 Waverly Street
Palo Alto, CA 94301

Oceania Productions
733 Plymouth Road
Claremont, CA 91711

Paulist Productions
17575 Pacific Coast Highway
Pacific Palisades, CA 90272

Premiere Presentations, Inc.
Chester Springs, PA 19425

Professional Arts, Inc.
PO Box 8484
Universal City, CA 91608

Psychological Cinema Register
Audio Visual Services
Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA 16802

Public Health Audiovisual Facility
Chamblee, GA 30005

Public Health Service
National Medical Audiovisual Center
Atlanta, GA 30333

RMI Film Productions
4916 Main Street
Kansas City, MO 64112

Smith, Kline & French Laboratories
1500 Spring Garden Street
Philadelphia, PA 19101

Sterling Films
43 West 61st Street
New York, NY 10023

Time-Life Films, Inc.
43 West 16th Street
New York, NY 10011

Universal Education & Visual Arts
221 Park Avenue South
New York, NY 10003

University of California
Extension Media Center
2223 Fulton Street
Berkeley, CA 94720

University of Southern California
Film Distribution
Cinema Division
Los Angeles, CA 90007

U. S. Bureau of Narcotics
and Dangerous Drugs
1405 I Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20537

Wyeth Film Library
Wyeth Laboratories
6290 Sunset Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90028

Youth Film Distribution Center
4 West 16th Street
New York, NY 10011

Zeal in Perpetuity Films
2220 Bridgeway
Sausalito, CA 94965

Educational Film Library Association
17 West 60 Street New York NY 10023

PUBLICATIONS LIST

BASIC FILM INFORMATION

■ Film Evaluation Guide 1946-1965	30.00
Supplement to Film Evaluation Guide 1965-67	12.00
Supplement to Film Evaluation Guide 1967-70	12.00
Film Evaluation – Why & How (EFLA Workshop Report)	1.50
Manual on Film Evaluation – Emily S. Jones	2.50
Using Films – James L. Limbacher	3.50
A Guide for Film Teachers – Roger Larsen	1.00
Educational Film Library Directory	1.00
Recommended Books, Pamphlets & Periodicals for a Film Information Collection	1.00

■ SELECTED FILM LISTS

American Film Festival Guides, 1959-1967	1.00 each
American Film Festival Guides – 1968 and 1969	2.00 each
Cumulative Index, 1959 to 1963 Guides	0.50
1959-1963 Guides with Index and Press Board Binder	5.00
Heavy Duty Wire Binder for Complete Set of Guides	4.50
Civil Rights: A Selected List of Films, Filmstrips, Recordings	1.00
Films and Filmstrips for the Space Age	1.00
Films for Children and Supplement, 1965	2.00
Water Pollutions: A Selected list of Recommended & Related-Films, 1965	1.00

■ NEW PUBLICATIONS

Films for Personnel Management – Louis S. Goodman	5.00
Films for Young Adults – Esther Helfand	2.00
99+ Films on Drugs – David Weber	3.00

■ PERIODICAL

Sightlines, five issues a year	8.00
Sightlines, single issue	2.00

Please send me the publication indicated above, I enclose .....

NAME .....

ORGANIZATION .....

ADDRESS .....

ZIP CODE .....